



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 44]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, अक्टूबर 31, 1992/कार्तिक 9, 1914

No. 44]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1992/KARTIKA 9, 1914

इस भाग में भिन्न वृष्ट संख्या की जाती है जिससे कि यह जलग संकलन के रूप में
रख जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-Section (ii)

(रक्षा-मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the
Ministry of Defence)

गृह मंत्रालय
(आसूचना ब्यूरो)

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 1992

का आ. 2749.—महायुक्त आसूचना ब्यूरो, जयपुर के
80 प्रतिशत में अधिक अधिकारियों/कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी
का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है। अतः केन्द्रीय
सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए
प्रयोग) नियमावली, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के
अनुसरण में इस कार्यालय को, एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करना है।

[सं 5/2/90—हिन्दी 1201]

टी गूडटे, उप निदेशक

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

(INTELLIGENCE BUREAU)

New Delhi, the 7th October, 1992

S.O. 2749.—More than 80% Officers/employees working
in the Subsidiary Intelligence Bureau, Jaipur have since ac-
quired working knowledge in Hindi. As such, in pursuance
of Sub-rule (4) of rule (10) of the Official Language (use for
official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Gov-
ernment hereby notifies the above-mentioned office of the
Bureau.

[No. 5/2/90-Hindi-1201]

T. GWITE, Dy. Director

वित्त मंत्रालय
(राजस्व विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 1992

(स्टाम्प)

का. आ. 2750.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899
(1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उधारा (1) के खण्ड
(क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय
सरकार एतद्वारा उस मुक्त को माफ करती है, जो हाउसिंग
एण्ड प्रजेंट डेवलपमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड के द्वारा
जारी किए जाने वाले मात्र तीन सौ करोड़ रुपये मूल्य के
9 प्रतिशत करमुक्त विमान्य अपरिवर्तनीय हड़को बंध-
पत्रों (श्रृंखला II)---के रूप में वणिज शिक्के के स्वरूप
के बंधपत्रों पर उक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत प्रभार्य है।

[संख्या 23/92—स्टाम्प—एफ संख्या 33/93/2एमटी]

आकुण्ठन, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th October, 1992

(STAMPS)

S.O. 2750.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause
(a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act,

1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the bonds in the nature of debentures—9% Tax-free Redeemable Non-convertible Hudco Bonds (Series II) of the value of rupees three hundred crores only to be issued by Housing & Urban Development Corporation Limited are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 23/92-Stamp-F. No. 33/3/92-ST]

THAKUR DATT, Dy. Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 1993

(स्टाम्प)

का. आ. 2751—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उस शुल्क को माफ करती है जो कि नेशनल थर्मल पावर कॉर्पोरेशन द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले मात्र चार सौ करोड़ रुपये के समेकित मूल्य के 1000/- रु० के अंकित मूल्य की विशिष्ट संख्या वाले प्रोमिसरी नोटों के स्वरूप के संबंध में (जी 00000001 से 40000000) 17 प्रतिशत आरक्षित विमोच्य कराधेय बंधपत्र VII निर्गम पर उक्त अधिनियम के तहत प्रभावी है।

[संख्या 24/92—स्टाम्प फा. संख्या 33/8/92-वि०क]

ठाकुरदत्त, उप-सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th October, 1992

(STAMPS)

S.O. 2751.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which 17% Secured redeemable taxable bonds VIIth Issue bearing distinctive numbers (G 00000001 to G 40000000) in the nature of promissory notes of the face value of Rs. 1000/- each and aggregate value of the rupees four hundred crores only to be issued by National Thermal Power Corporation are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 24/92-Stamp-F. No. 33/8/92-ST]

THAKUR DUTT, Dy. Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली 7 अक्टूबर, 1992

स्टाम्प

का. आ. 2752—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा गुजरात औद्योगिक निवेश निगम लि. अहमदाबाद को मात्र दो लाख, पांच हजार और पांच सौ रुपये का समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क भुगतान करने

की अनुमति प्रदान करती है जोकि उक्त निगम के द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले मात्र दो करोड़ और चौहत्तर लाख रुपये के कुल मूल्य के एक एक लाख रुपये के अंतिम मूल्य के ऋणपत्रों के रूप में 1 से 274 बान्डों की विशिष्ट संख्या वाले 12 प्रतिशत बान्ड 25 वीं श्रृंखला पर स्टाम्प शुल्क के कारण प्रभार है।

[संख्या 22/92—स्टाम्प फा. सं

33/39/92—वि. कं.]

ठाकुर दत्त, उप सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th October, 1992

(STAMPS)

S.O. 2752.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits Gujarat Industrial Investment Corporation Limited Ahmedabad to pay consolidated stamp duty of rupees two lakhs, five thousand and five hundred only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on 12% bonds, 25th series bearing distinctive numbers 1 to 274 bonds in the form of debentures of the face value of rupees one lakh each of the aggregate value of rupees two crores and seventy four lakhs only to be issued by the said Corporation.

[No. 22/92-Stamp F. No. 33/39/92-ST]

THAKUR DATT, Dy. Secy.

आयकर आयुक्त, हरियाणा

रोहतक, 4 मितम्बर, 1992

(आयकर)

का. आ. 2753—आयकर आयुक्त, हरियाणा, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड 44 के अनुसरण में तथा दिनांक 27-6-1991 की अधिसूचना संख्या 77 फा. संख्या 7(153)/गो. शा. 91-92 को संशोधन के साथ अधिकांश करते हुए श्री बी.एस. चाकला, आयकर अधिकारी को दिनांक 19-4-90 के आदेश फा. संख्या गो शा./28 (19/89)—90/15 में परिभाषित क्षेत्रों पर उपयुक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी हिसार की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करने हैं।

2. यह अधिसूचना उपयुक्त अधिकारी द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी का कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होगी।

[संख्या 377/फा. सं. 7 (153)/गो शा./92-93]

एस के गोयल, आयकर आयुक्त

COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX, HARYANA

Rohtak, the 4th September, 1992

(INCOME TAX)

S.O. 2753.—In pursuance of clause (44) of section 2 of the income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in partial modification and supersession of notification No. 77 F. No. 7(153)/CB/91-92/dated 27-6-1991, Commissioner of Income-tax, Haryana, Rohtak hereby authorises Shri B. S. Chakatta, Income-tax Office to exercise the powers of the Tax Recovery Officer, Hissar under the said Act over the areas as defined vide order F. No. CB/28(19)/89-90/15 dated 19-4-1990.

2. This notification shall come into force with effect from the date the above mentioned officer take over charge of Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 377/F. No. 7(153)/CB/92-93]

S. K. GOYAL, Commissioner of Income Tax

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 अक्टूबर, 1992

का. प्रा. 2754.—केंद्रीय सरकार राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग, निमाधली, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में वित्त मंत्रालय (आर्थिक कार्य विभाग) के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण में स्थित भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारीबृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यासाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है —

1. मंडल कार्यालय, गांधी नगर
2. शाखा कार्यालय, गांधी नगर
3. शाखा कार्यालय, मेहसाणा
4. शाखा कार्यालय, विसनगर
5. शाखा कार्यालय, बड़नगर
6. शाखा कार्यालय, बीजापुर
7. शाखा कार्यालय, कलोल
8. शाखा कार्यालय, कड़ी
9. शाखा कार्यालय पाटण
10. शाखा कार्यालय, सिद्धपुर
11. शाखा कार्यालय, ऊँठा
12. शाखा कार्यालय, पालनपुर
13. शाखा कार्यालय, डोसा
13. शाखा कार्यालय, राधनपुर
15. शाखा कार्यालय, इंदर
16. शाखा कार्यालय, हिम्मत नगर
17. शाखा कार्यालय, प्रान्तिज
18. शाखा कार्यालय, मोडासा

19. शाखा कार्यालय, धनसुरा
20. शाखा कार्यालय, मानसा
21. शाखा कार्यालय, खेड़ब्रह्मा
22. शाखा कार्यालय, मिलोडा
23. शाखा कार्यालय, पालनपुर
24. शाखा कार्यालय, चाणस्मा

[संख्या 13011/1/92-हि.का.क]

प्रदीप पुरी, उप सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 9th October, 1992

S.O. 2754.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices of the Life Insurance Corporation of India (Under the Administrative Control of Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs) where of more than 80 per cent of staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi.

1. Divisional Office, Gaudhinagar
2. Branch Office, Gandhinagar
3. Branch Office, Mehsana
4. Branch Office, Visnagar
5. Branch Office, Badnagar
6. Branch Office, Beejapur
7. Branch Office, Kalol
8. Branch Office, Kadi
9. Branch Office, Patan
10. Branch Office, Sidhpur
11. Branch Office, Unjha
12. Branch Office, Palanpur
13. Branch Office, Dausa
14. Branch Office, Radhanpur
15. Branch Office, Ider
16. Branch Office, Himmatnagar
17. Branch Office, Prantij
18. Branch Office, Modasa
19. Branch Office, Dhansura
20. Branch Office, Mansa
21. Branch Office, Khedbraham
22. Branch Office, Miloda
23. Branch Office, Palanpur
24. Branch Office, Chanasma

[No. 13011/1/92-HIC]

PRADEEP PURI, Dy. Secy

नई दिल्ली, 9 अक्टूबर, 1992

का. प्रा. 2755.—केंद्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग), नियमावली, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में वित्त मंत्रालय (आर्थिक कार्य विभाग) के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण में स्थित भारतीय

साधारण बीमा निगम निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारीवृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्य-साधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :—

कम्पनी का नाम :

I. दि न्यू इंडिया एश्योरेस कंपनी लिमिटेड

1. मंडल कार्यालय, अलीबाग
2. मंडल कार्यालय, मोती महल
3. मंडल कार्यालय-III, सूरत
4. मंडल कार्यालय, उधना
5. शाखा कार्यालय, पुनवेल
6. शाखा कार्यालय, डोमबेली
7. शाखा कार्यालय-I, उधना
8. शाखा कार्यालय-II, उधना
9. शाखा कार्यालय-III, उधना

II. दि ओरिएण्टल इश्योरेस कंपनी लिमिटेड

1. मंडल कार्यालय-15, नई दिल्ली
2. मंडल कार्यालय-16, नई दिल्ली
3. मंडल कार्यालय-17, नई दिल्ली
4. मंडल कार्यालय-18, नई दिल्ली
5. शाखा कार्यालय 3, फनीदाबाद
6. शाखा कार्यालय, पालम
7. शाखा कार्यालय-9, दिल्ली
8. शाखा कार्यालय, साहिबाबाद
9. शाखा कार्यालय, नांगलोई, नई दिल्ली
10. शाखा कार्यालय, मेहरोली, नई दिल्ली
11. शाखा कार्यालय, सराय जुलैना
12. शाखा कार्यालय, डायरेक्ट एजेंट ब्रांच, दिल्ली

III. यूनाइटेड इंडिया इश्योरेस कंपनी लिमिटेड

1. नगर शाखा कार्यालय-2, इंदौर
2. नगर शाखा कार्यालय-4, इंदौर
3. शाखा कार्यालय, देवास
4. शाखा कार्यालय, महु
5. मंडल कार्यालय, रायपुर
6. नगर शाखा कार्यालय-I, रायपुर
7. नगर शाखा कार्यालय-II, रायपुर
8. शाखा कार्यालय, जगदलपुर
9. शाखा कार्यालय, राजनन्दगाव
10. शाखा कार्यालय, छिंदवाड़ा
11. शाखा कार्यालय, धामनोद
12. शाखा कार्यालय, बडवाह
13. नगर शाखा कार्यालय, कोरवा
14. शाखा कार्यालय, अम्बिकापुर

IV. नेशनल इश्योरेस कंपनी लिमिटेड

1. मंडल कार्यालय, अम्बाला
2. शाखा कार्यालय, बालाघाट
3. शाखा कार्यालय, गोहना
4. शाखा कार्यालय-2, पामीपत
5. शाखा कार्यालय-2, शिमला
6. शाखा कार्यालय-5, जयपुर
7. शाखा कार्यालय, मृधुनू
8. शाखा कार्यालय-6, जयपुर

[सं 13011/1/92-हि. का. क.]

प्रदीप पुरी, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th October, 1992

S.O. 2755.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies the following office of the General Insurance Corporation of India (Under the Administrative Control of Ministry of Finance, (Department of Economic Affairs) where of more than 80 per cent of staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi.

Name of the Company : The New India Assurance Co. Ltd.,

1. Divisional Office, Alibagh
2. Divisional Office, Motimahal
3. Divisional Office-III, Surat
4. Divisional Office, Ughna
5. Branch Office, Punvelli
6. Branch Office, Dombevali
7. Branch Office-I, Ughna
8. Branch Office-II, Ughna
9. Branch Office-III, Ughna.

The Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd.,

1. Divisional Office-15, New Delhi
2. Divisional Office-16, New Delhi
3. Divisional Office-17, New Delhi
4. Divisional Office-18, New Delhi
5. Branch Office, Faridabad
6. Branch Office, Palam
7. Branch Office, Sahibabad
9. Branch Office-9 Delhi
10. Branch Office, Nangloi
11. Branch Office, Mehroli, New Delhi
12. Branch Office, Sarai Julaina
13. Branch Office, Direct Agent Branch, Delhi.

United India Insurance Co. Ltd.,

1. City Branch Office-2, Indore
2. City Branch Office-4, Indore
3. Branch Office, Mahu
4. Divisional Office, Raipur
5. City Branch Office-I, Raipur
6. City Branch Office-2, Raipur
7. Branch Office, Jagdalpur
8. Branch Office, Rajnandgaon

9. Branch Office, Chindwada
10. Branch Office, Dhamnod
11. Branch Office, Budhwah
12. Branch Office, Anabikapur
13. City Branch Office, Korba

National Insurance Co. Ltd.,

1. Divisional Office, Ambala
2. Divisional Office, Balaghat
3. Branch Office, Gohna
4. Branch Office-2, Panipat
5. Branch Office, Shimla
6. Branch Office-5, Jaipur
7. Branch Office, Jhunjhunoo
8. Branch Office-6, Jaipur.

[No. 13011/1/92-HIC]

PRADEEP PURI, Dy. Secy.

(वैकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 सितम्बर, 1992

का. भा. 2756—सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एम्वू द्वारा निम्न-लिखित सारणी के कालम (1) में उल्लिखित उन अधिकारियों को नियुक्त करती है, जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारियों के स्तर के समकक्ष अधिकारी होंगे और उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए सम्पदा अधिकारी होंगे और उक्त अधिकारी, उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेंगे तथा उसके अधीन उक्त सारणी के कालम (2) में उल्लिखित सरकारी स्थानों के सम्बन्ध में अपने अधिकार क्षेत्र की स्थानीय सीमाओं के अन्तर्गत सम्पदा अधिकारियों को सौंपे गए कर्तव्यों को पूरा करेंगे।

सारणी

अधिकारी का पत्र	सरकारी स्थानों की श्रेणियाँ और अधिकार क्षेत्र की सीमा
(1)	(2)
1. महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, जी. ए. पी. डी एस्टेट प्रभाग, श्रीनिकेतन भवन शिवमसागी एस्टेट, डा० ए० बी० रोड, बर्ली, बम्बई-400018.	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की अथवा उसके द्वारा अथवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए महाराष्ट्र राज्य के बम्बई और थाणे जिलों में अवस्थित स्थान।
2. उप महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक नागालाल चम्बर्से, द्वितीय तल, आश्रम रोड, पो. गा. - 9, महमदाबाद।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की अथवा उसके द्वारा अथवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए गुजरात राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।
3. उप महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, 113/1, जीवन प्रकाश, अन्ट्रेस भवन, जे. सी रोड पो. बा. नं० 29 बंगलोर-560002।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की अथवा उसके द्वारा अथवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए कर्नाटक राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।

(1)

(2)

4. उप महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, 122-ए, स्टेशन स्क्वायर, पो० बा० नंबर 179, भुवनेश्वर-751001
राष्ट्रीय बैंक की अथवा उसके द्वारा अथवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए उड़ीसा राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।
5. उप महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, 5/5, अरेरा कालोनी, ब्रिटेन मार्केट रोड गंकर नगर, पो. ग्रामिण पो. बा. नं० 13 भोपाल-462016
राष्ट्रीय बैंक की अथवा उसके द्वारा अथवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।
6. उप महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, अभिमाया, द्वितीय तल, 6, रोयड स्ट्रीट पो. बा. नं० 9083 कावकावा-700016
राष्ट्रीय बैंक की अथवा उसके द्वारा अथवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए पश्चिम बंगाल और मित्रिम और अण्डमान और निकोबार द्वीप समूह में अवस्थित स्थान।
7. उप महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक डा. के. बी. काम रोड, पनबाजार पो. बा. नं० 81 गुवाहाटी-781001।
राष्ट्रीय बैंक की अथवा उसके द्वारा अथवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए आसाम और अन्य उत्तर-पूर्वी राज्यों तथा अरुणाचल प्रदेश, मणिपुर मिजोरम मेघालय नागालैण्ड और त्रिपुरा राज्यों में अवस्थित स्थान।
8. उप महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, यशुगिरि चैम्बर्से, 1-1-61, फार. टी. सी. "एक्स" रोड, पो. बा. नं० 1863, मुर शिवाबाद, हैदराबाद-500 020।
राष्ट्रीय बैंक की अथवा उसके द्वारा अथवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।
9. उप महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, सी-93, सुभाष मार्ग, "सी" स्कीम, पो. बा. नं० 10, अजपुर-302 001
राष्ट्रीय बैंक की अथवा उसके द्वारा अथवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए राजस्थान राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।
10. उप महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, एक-1794, शास्त्री नगी, एकटेन्गन, पो. बा. नं० 2, जम्मू-180 004
राष्ट्रीय बैंक की अथवा उसके द्वारा अथवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए जम्मू और कश्मीर राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।

(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
11. उप-महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, 10, उत्तमार्, गांधी रोड, पो. बा. नं. 6074, मद्रास-600 034।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की श्रयवा उसके द्वारा श्रयवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए तमिलनाडु राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।	18. महा-प्रबन्धक राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, काकस हाउस, हवोबुन्साह एस्टेट, 11, एम. जी., पो. बा. नं. 364, हजरतगंज, लखनऊ-260 001।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की श्रयवा उसके द्वारा श्रयवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।
12. उप-महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, 54, बैलैसले रोड, पो. बा. नं. 5, शिवाजी नगर, पुणे-411 005।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की श्रयवा उसके द्वारा श्रयवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए, महाराष्ट्र राज्य, बम्बई और बाणे जिलों को छोड़कर अवस्थित स्थान।	19. प्रभारी अधिकारी, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, निजारी भवन, तृतीय तल, मेनेजेस प्रगाजा रोड, पणजी-403 001।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की श्रयवा उसके द्वारा श्रयवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए गोवा राज्य में अव- स्थित स्थान।
13. उप-महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, एक्सप्रेस भवन (एनेक्स), मृतीय तल, 10, बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, पो. बा. नं. 12, नई दिल्ली-110 002।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की श्रयवा उसके द्वारा श्रयवा उसकी ओर से संघ राज्य क्षेत्र दिल्ली में अवस्थित स्थान।		
14. उप-महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, मोयं लोक कम्पलेक्स, "स्पाक "बी", बीधा और पांचवा तल, डाक बंगला रोड, पो. बा. नं. 178, पटना-800001।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की श्रयवा उसके द्वारा श्रयवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए बिहार राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।		
15. उप-महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, रैन बसेरा, रेवेलिनी, गिमला-171 002।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की श्रयवा उसके द्वारा श्रयवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य में अवस्थित स्थान।		
16. उप-महाप्रबन्धक, राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, कार्पोरेट बिल्डिंग एनेक्स, पो. बा. नं. 6505, विकास भवन, पोस्ट आफिस, त्रिवेन्द्रम-695 003।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की श्रयवा उसके द्वारा श्रयवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए केरल राज्य में अव- स्थित स्थान।		
17. महा प्रबन्धक राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, कालसी भवन, एम. सी. ओ. नं. 179-180 सेक्टर नं. 17-सी, पो. बा. नं. 35, चांडीगढ़-160 017।	राष्ट्रीय बैंक की श्रयवा उस द्वारा श्रयवा उसकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए चण्डीगढ़ और हरि- याणा और पंजाब राज्यों में अवस्थित स्थान।		

[एफ. सं. 15/14/91--बो. ओ.-III]

क. क. संगत, अवर सचिव

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 25th September, 1992

S.O. 2756.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officers mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being officers equivalent to the rank of gazetted officers of Government, to be estate officers for the purposes of the said Act, and the said officers shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on the estate officers by or under the said Act, within the local limits of their respective jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table :—

THE TABLE

Designation of the Officer	Categories of public premise and local limits of jurisdiction
1	2
1. The General Manager National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, GAPD-Estate Division, Shriniketan Building, Shivsagar Estate, Dr. A.B. Road, Worli, Bombay-400018.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in Bombay and Thane District in the State of Maharashtra.
2. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Nanlal Chambers, 2nd Floor, Ashram Road, P.B. No. 8, Ahmedabad-380 009.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Gujarat.

1	2	1	2
3. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Development, 113/1, Jeevan Prakash, Annexe Bldg., J.C. Road, Post Box No. 29 Bangalore-560 002.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Karnataka.	10. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, F-1794, Shastri Nagar, Extension P.B. No. 2, Jammu-180 004.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Jammu & Kashmir.
4. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, E/5, Area Colony, Bittan Market, Ravi Shankar Nagar, Post Office, P.B. No. 13, Bhopal-462 016	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Madhya Pradesh.	11. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, 105, Uttamar Gandhi Rd. Post Box No. 6074, Madras-600 034	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank, in the State of Tamil Nadu.
5. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Abhulasha, 2nd floor, 6, Royd Street, Post Bag No. 9083 Calcutta-700016.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of West Bengal and the State of Sikkim and Union Territory of Andaman & Nicobar Islands.	12. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, 54, Wellesley Road, P.B. No. 5, Shivaji Ngr., Pune-411005.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank, in the State of Maharashtra except Bombay and Thane Districts.
6. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, 122 A, Station Square, Post Box No. 179, Bhubaneswar-751 001.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Orissa.	13. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Express Buliding (Annexe), 3rd Floor, 10, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, P.B. No. 12, New Delhi-110 002.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the Union Territory of Delhi.
7. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Dr. J.C. Das Road, Panbazar, P.B. No. 81, Guwahati-781 001.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Assam and other North-Eastern States, namely, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram Meghalaya, Nagaland and Tripura.	14. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Maurya Lok Complex, Block 'B', 4th & 5th floor, Dak Bunglow Road, P.B. No. 178, Patna-800 001.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Bihar.
8. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Yedugiri Chambers, 1-1-61, R.T.C., 'X' Road, Post Box No. 1863 Musheerabad Hyderabad-500 020.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of National Bank in the State of Andhra Pradesh.	15. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Rain Basera, Khalini, Shimla-171 002.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Himachal Pradesh.
9. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development C-93, Subhash Marg, 'C' Scheme, P.B. No. 10, Jaipur-302 001	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Rajasthan.	16. The Deputy General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Corporation Bulg. Annexe P.B. No. 6505, Vikas Bhavan Post Office Trivandrum-695 033.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Kerala.

1	2
17. The General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Kalsi Building, S.C.O. No. 179-180, Sector No. 17-C, P.B. No. 35, Chandigarh-160 017	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the Union Territory of Chandigarh and the States of Haryana and Punjab.
18. The General Manager, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Commerce House, Habibullah Estate, 11, M.G. Marg, P.B.No. 364, Hazratganj, Lucknow-226 001.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Uttar Pradesh.
19. The Officer-in-charge, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Nizari Bhavan, 3rd floor, Menzes Braganza Road, Panaji-403001.	Premises belonging to, or taken on lease by, or on behalf of the National Bank in the State of Goa.

[F.No.15/14/91-B.O.-III]
K.K. MANGAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 1992

कां.प्रा. 2757 :—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उप-धारा 1 के प्रावधान इस अधिसूचना के सरकारी राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से 31 मई, 1993 तक हुंजरपुर केन्द्रीय सहकारी बैंक लि., हुंजरपुर (राजस्थान राज्य) पर लागू नहीं होंगे।

[मं. 6-2/92-प.सी.]

प्रवीण कुमार तेजयान, सचिव

New Delhi, the 1st October, 1992

S.O. 2757.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of sub-section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Dungarpur Kendriya Sahakari Bank Ltd., Dungarpur (Rajasthan State) from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette to 31 May, 1993.

[F. No. 6(2)/92-AC]
P. K. TEJYAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 अक्टूबर, 1992

कां.प्रा. 2758 :—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 के खण्ड 8 के उपखण्ड (1) के साथ पठित खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् एतद्वारा श्री एम. गोपालकृष्णैया, वर्तमान महाप्रबंधक, आंध्र बैंक को उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से 30 जून, 1997 तक के लिए बैंक आफ महाराष्ट्र के पूर्णकालिक निदेशक (कार्यकारी निदेशक के रूप में परनामित) के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[मं. एफ. 9-61/91-बी.ओ.-1]

के.जी. गोयल, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 8th October, 1992

S.O. 2758.—In pursuance of sub-clause (a) of clause 3 read with sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri M. Gopalakrishnaiah, presently General Manager, Andhra Bank, as a whole-time Director (designated as the Executive Director) of the Bank of Maharashtra for a period commencing with the date of his taking charge and ending with 30th June, 1997.

[F. No. 9/61/91-B.O.1]

K. G. GOEL, Director

वाणिज्य संज्ञाव्य

नई दिल्ली, 27 अगस्त, 1992

कां.प्रा. 2759 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में वाणिज्य संज्ञाव्य के अधिनियम अन्तर्गत लिखित कार्यालय को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारीवृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :—

भारतीय निर्यात शृणु गारंटी निगम लि.,
आगरा शाखा कार्यालय, 9/4, संजय प्लेस,
आगरा-282002 (उ.प्र.)

[सं. ई-11011/15/90-हिन्दी]

सुन्दर नाथ धर्महोत्री, उप निदेशक (राजभाषा)

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

New Delhi, the 27th August, 1992

S.O. 2759.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official purposes of the Union), Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby Notifies the following Offices under the Ministry of Commerce where of more than 80% staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi :—

E.C.G.C. of India Ltd.
Agra Branch Office,
9/4 Sanjay Place,
Agra 282002 (U.P.).

[No. E-11011/15/90-Hindi]

S. N. AGNIHOTRI, Dy. Director (O.L.)

नई दिल्ली, 13 अक्टूबर, 1992

कां.प्रा. 2760 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा

प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हिमशीतल मछली और मछली उत्पादों का निर्यात (व्याजिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1987 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमशीतल मछली और मछली उत्पादों का निर्यात (व्याजिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1992 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. हिमशीतल मछली और मछली उत्पादों का निर्यात (व्याजिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1987 के नियम 10 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

"10. निरीक्षण फीस:—प्रत्येक परेषण के लिए न्यूनतम 30 रुपए के अधीन रहते हुए, निर्यातकर्ता, अभिकरण को निम्नलिखित दर पर निरीक्षण फीस के रूप में फीस का संदाय करेंगे, अर्थात्:—

मद	परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के लिए (प्रक्रिया के दौरान व्याजिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण के अधीन किए गए निरीक्षण के लिए) नियम 3 (ख) के अनुसार (प्रति किलो-ग्राम या उसके भाग के लिए पैसे)	प्रक्रिया के दौरान व्याजिटी नियंत्रण प्रणाली के अधीन अनुमोदित युनिटों से शिफ्ट के अनुसार (प्रति किलो-ग्राम या उसके भाग के लिए पैसे)
1	2	3
हिमशीतल मीन (सभी प्रकार के)	इक्यावन (51)	छब्बीस (26)
हिमशीतल समुद्री मीन (सभी प्रकार के)	एक सौ छत्तीस (136)	अड़सठ (68)
हिमशीतल कटल मछली/फिलेट	बीस (20)	दस (10)
हिमशीतल रिकबड	सतरह (17)	नौ (9)
हिमशीतल पामफिट तथा	बारह (12)	छह (6)
अन्य हिमशीतल मछली		
हिमशीतल फ्रेश मांस	उन्नीस (19)	दस (10)

टिप्पणी:—प्रत्येक परेषण के लिए निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा दी जाने वाली निरीक्षण फीस की राशि निकटतम रुपए तक पूर्णांकित की जाएगी और इस प्रयोजन के लिए जहां ऐसी राशि का भाग पैसे हों, वहां यदि ऐसा भाग पचास पैसे या अधिक हो तो वह बढ़ाकर एक रुपया कर दिया जाएगा और यदि ऐसा भाग पचास पैसे से कम हो तो उसे छोड़ दिया जाएगा।"

[फाईन सं० 2(1)/85-ई आई एण्ड ई पी]

कुमारी सुमा मुखर्जा, निदेशक

और भारत के राजपत्र भाग-II, खंड-3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 22 अक्टूबर, 1988 में प्रकाशित किया गया और कां०भा० 2491 तारीख 7 अक्टूबर, 1989, कां०भा० 2717 तारीख 10 अक्टूबर, 1990 तथा 2398 तारीख 28-9-91।

New Delhi, the 13th October, 1992

S.O. 2760.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Frozen Fish and Fishery Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1987, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Frozen Fish & Fishery Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1992;

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Frozen Fish & Fishery Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1987, for rule 10, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"10. Inspection Fee : Subject to a minimum of Rs. 30/- for each consignment, a fee at the following rates shall be paid by the exporters to the agency as inspection fee, namely:—

Item	For consignment-wise inspection (other than units approved under Inprocess Quality Control System) as per rule 3(a) (Paise per kg or part thereof)	For inspection carried out under Inprocess Quality Control System (IPQC) as per rule 3(b) (Paise per Kg. or part thereof)
1	2	3
Frozen Shrimps (All types)	Fifty One	Twenty Six
Frozen Lobsters (All types)	One hundred Thirty Six	Sixty Eight
Frozen Cuttle-fish/Fillet	Twenty	Ten
Frozen Squids	Seventeen	Nine
Frozen Promp-frets and other Frozen Fish	Twelve	Six
Frozen Crab Meat	Nineteen	Ten

Note:—The amount of inspection fee for each consignment payable by the exporter shall be rounded off to the nearest rupee and, for this purpose, where such amount contains a part of a rupee consisting of paise, then, if such part is fifty paise or more, it shall be increased to one rupee and if each part is less than fifty paise, it shall be ignored.

[F. No. 2(1)/85-EI&EP]

KUM. SUMA, SUBBANNA, Director

Foot note:—The Principal rules were published vide S.O. 1153(E) dated 9th April, 1988 in the Gazette of

पाद टिप्पण:—मूल अधिसूचना कां०भा० 1153(म) तारीख 9 अप्रैल, 1988 भारत के राजपत्र भाग-II, खंड-3, उपखंड (iii) तारीख 9 अप्रैल, 1988 में प्रकाशित की गयी थी और तत्पश्चात् उसकी कां०भा० 3162 तारीख 22 अक्टूबर, 1988 द्वारा संशोधित किया गया 2547 G/92—2

India, Part-II, Section 3; sub-section (ii) dated 9th April, 1988 and subsequently amended by S.O. 3162 dated 22 October, 1988 and published in the Gazette of India, part-II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated 22 October, 1988 and S.O. 2491 dated 7 October, 1989, S.O. 2717 dated 10 October, 1990 and S.O. 2396 dated 28th September, 1991.

नई दिल्ली, 13 अक्टूबर, 1992

कां० 2761:—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, डिब्बा बंद मछली और मछली उत्पादों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1983 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम डिब्बा बंद मछली और मछली उत्पादों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1992 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. डिब्बा बंद मछली और मछली उत्पादों का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1983 के नियम 8 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

"8. निरीक्षण फीस:—निम्न दर से फीस का भुगतान:—

(1) जब निरीक्षण नियम 5(क) और 5(ग) के आधार पर किया जाता है तो सभी प्रकार के डिब्बा बंद शिगों (शिम्प) के लिए प्रति किलोग्राम या उसके किसी भाग के लिए प्रत्येक, जैसे और डिब्बा बंद केकड़े के मांस के लिए प्रति किलोग्राम या उसके किसी भाग के लिए मात जैसे।

(2) जब निरीक्षण नियम 5(ख) के आधार पर किया जाता है तो डिब्बा बंद शिगों (शिम्प) के लिए प्रति किलोग्राम या उसके किसी भाग के लिए पैंतीस पैसे और डिब्बा बंद केकड़े के मांस के लिए प्रति किलोग्राम या उसके किसी भाग के लिए तेरह पैसे, निर्यातकर्ता अभिकरण को निरीक्षण शुल्क के रूप में देगा।

टिप्पण:—ऐसे प्रत्येक परीक्षण के लिए निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा दी जाने वाली निरीक्षण फीस की राशि निकटतम रूप, तक पूर्णांकित की जाएगी और इस प्रयोजन के लिए जहाँ ऐसी राशि में रूप का भाग पैसे हो, वहाँ यदि ऐसा भाग पचास पैसे या अधिक हो तो वह बढ़ाकर एक रूपया कर दिया जाएगा और यदि ऐसा भाग पचास पैसे से कम हो तो उसे छोड़ दिया जाएगा।

[फाईल सं० 21(1)/85-ईआईएण्ड ईपी]

कुमारी सुमा सुब्बान्ना, निदेशक

पाद टिप्पण:—मूल अधिसूचना कां० 863 तारीख 12-2-1983 भारत के राजपत्र, भाग-II खंड-3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 12 फरवरी, 1983 में प्रकाशित की गयी थी और तत्पश्चात् उसमें कां० 763 (प्र) तारीख 15 अक्टूबर, 1985, कां० 700 (प्र) तारीख 01 अक्टूबर, 1986, कां० 877 (प्र) तारीख 1 अक्टूबर 1987, कां० 3163 तारीख 22 अक्टूबर 1988, कां० 2492 तारीख 7 अक्टूबर, 1989 और कां० 2718 तारीख 10 अक्टूबर, 1990, कां० 2397 तारीख 28-9-91 द्वारा संशोधन किया गया।

New Delhi, the 13th October, 1992

S.O. 2761.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Export of Canned Fish and Fishery Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1983, namely:—

1. (1) These rules, may be called the Export of Canned fish and Fishery Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1992;

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Canned Fish and Fishery Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1983, for rule 8, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"8. Inspection fee—A fee at the rate of—

(i) Eighteen paise per kg. or part thereof for all types of Canned Prawns (Shrimps) and Seven paise per kg. or part thereof for Canned Crab Meat, when the inspection is carried out on the basis of rule 5(a) and 5(c); and

(ii) Thirtyfive paise per kg. or part thereof for all types of Canned Prawns (Shrimps) and Thirteen paise per kg. or part thereof for Canned Crab Meat, when the inspection is carried out on the basis of rule 5(b).

shall be paid by the exporter to the agency as inspection fee.

Note: The amount of inspection fee for each consignment payable by the exporter shall be rounded off to the nearest rupee and, for this purpose, where such amount contains a part of a rupee consisting of paise, then, if such part is fifty paise or more it shall be increased to one rupee and if such part is less than fifty paise, it shall be ignored".

[F. No. 2(1)/85-EI&EP]

KUM. SUMA SUBBANNA, Director

Foot note: The Principal notification was published vide S.O. 863 dated 12 February, 1983 in the Official Gazette, Part-II, Section-3, Sub-section (ii) dated 12 February, 1983 and amended by S.O. 763(E) dated 15 October, 1985, S.O. 700(E) dated 1 October, 1986, S.O. 877 (E) dated 1 October, 1987, S.O. 3136 dated 22 October, 1988, S.O. 2492 dated 7 October, 1989 and S.O. 2718 dated 10 October, 1990, S.O. 2397 dated 28th September, 1991.

नागरिक प्रति, उपभोक्ता मामले और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय

भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1992

कां.प्रा.०2762:—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम, 1988 के विनियम 5 के उपविनियम (6) के अनुसरण में एतद्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन प्रमाणन मुहर लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, उनको अवधि समाप्त हो गई है।

अनुसूची

क्रम शाहसेंस संख्या सं०	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम	भारतीय मानक से सम्बद्ध	रद्द होने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. 0025117	कृष्णवैनी इंक फैक्ट्री, 751 तिरुवोट्टियूर, हाई रोड, मद्रास-400081	IS 1221 : 1971	91-12-31
2. 0121012	अन्नपूर्णा बिस्कुट मैनु० क०, 84/67 जी०टी० रोड, कानपुर-208003	IS 1011 : 1981	92-02-18
3. 0244230	वेन्स एग्रो कौमीकल्स एंड एलाइड इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, 15 और 16 कोयम्बसूर प्रा० इंड एस्टेट, कोयम्बसूर-641021	IS 561 : 1978	92-01-15
4. 0377451	रैलिस इंडिया लि०, रैलिस हाऊस, 21 वामोदरदास भुखादवाला एमजी, फोर्ट, बम्बई-400001	IS 5281 : 1979	92-03-31
5. 0504432	पेनटाकैम, 20/23 इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, खेडगांव, अहमदनगर-414001 (महा०)	IS 561 : 1978	92-04-30
6. 0532437	कृषि रसायन, बड़ा इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, आर०के० आश्रम, मुजफ्फरपुर-843116	IS 2567 : 1978	92-03-15
7. 0536344	रैलिस इंडिया लि०, (फटिलाइजर्स एंड पेस्टीसाइड्स डिबीजन), रैलिस हाऊस, 21 रेविलाइन स्ट्रीट फोर्ट, बम्बई-400001	IS 2682 : 1984	92-03-31
8. 0563145	गुप्ता कौमीकल्स प्रा० लि०, भाबुमारिया बिल्डिंग, पहला तल, श्रीजीकी मोरी के सामने, त्रिपोलिया बाजार, जयपुर-302001	IS 1308 : 1984	92-04-30
9. 0672554	बीर इंजी० वर्क्स (रत्रि०) जी०टी० रोड, मकसूदन, जालंधर-144008	IS 780 : 1984	92-01-31
10. 0678364	पालानी एंडावर कॉटन एंड सिंथेटिक स्पिनिंग मिल्स लि०, 236/1 धाले रोड, उदमलपेट-642126	IS 834 : 1905	92-02-29
11. 0721541	यूनिवर्सल इंडस्ट्रीज एंड काटन मिल्स लि०, 9/1 आर०एन० मुखर्जी रोड, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 6914 : 1978	92-03-15
12. 0721642	यूनिवर्सल इंडस्ट्रीज एंड काटन मिल्स लि०, 9/1, आर०एन० मुखर्जी रोड, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 6915 : 1978	92-03-15

1	2	3	4
13. 0758862	स्वदेशी एन्टरप्राइजेज एंड कॅमीकल्स इंडस्ट्रीज, 26/50, बिशाना रोड, कानपुर-208001	IS 561 : 1978	92-02-29
14. 0870255	एलाइस मिल्स (लैसेस) प्रा० लि०, 18 नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 1943 : 1964	92-03-31
15. 0918156	गुप्ता कॅमीकल्स प्रा० लि०, भुखमरिया बिर्लिंग, पहला तल, श्रीजी की मोरी के सामने, त्रिपोलिया बाजार, जयपुर-302001	IS 2568 : 1978	93-04-30
16. 1142126	कृषि रसायन, बड़ा इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, आर०के० आश्रम, मुजफ्फरपुर-843116	IS 632 : 1978	92-03-15
17. 1183039	हिन्दुस्तान इलेक्ट्रोसाइड्स लि०, उद्योग मंडल, केरल-683501	IS 2567 : 1978	92-05-15
18. 1253943	विश्व कॅमीकल्स, डब्ल्यू 24, एमआईडीसी एरिया, हिगना रोड, नागपुर-440016	IS 9825 : 1981	90-12-13
19. 1255139	क्विक प्रिंट इंडस्ट्रीज, 7/153, स्वरूपनगर, कानपुर :	IS 868 : 1956	92-03-31
20. 1265950	श्री लक्ष्मी पेन्ट्स एंड वार्निश वर्क्स, बी-3, इंड एस्टेट, गुदूर ।	IS 123 : 1962	92-01-15
21. 1273848	स्वदेशी एन्टरप्राइजेज एंड कॅमीकल्स इंडस्ट्रीज, 26/50, बिशाना रोड, कानपुर-208001	IS 562 : 1978	92-02-29
22. 1308841	श्रीहृष कॅमीकल्स एन्टरप्राइजेज प्रा० लि०, 36/37, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, उज्जैन रोड, देवास-455001	IS 4984 : 1987	92-04-30
23. 1313026	क्रिस्तान एग्री कॅमीकल्स पो० बा० नं० 248, कोर्ट रोड, मुजफ्फर नगर-251001	IS 4323 : 1980	92-05-31
24. 1361643	ध्रुव पेस्टीसाइड्स, 15 हबीब मंजिल रोड नं० 1, ईशगाह हिल्स, भोपाल ।	IS 562 : 1978	92-03-31
25. 1362645	स्वदेशी एन्टरप्राइजेज एंड कॅमीकल्स इंडस्ट्रीज, 26/50, बिशाना रोड, कानपुर-208001	IS 3903 : 1984	92-02-29
26. 1383855	फलागा एप्लाइजेज मैनुफैक्चरिंग इंडस्ट्रीज, पटेल एस्टेट, प्रतापनगर, बड़ौदा-390004	IS 4246 : 1984	92-02-29
27. 1394254	हनुत सेल्स कारपोरेशन, 140 इंड, एरिया, जोतवाड़ा, जयपुर-302012	IS 10325 : 1989	92-03-31
28. 1404029	कार्बन इंडिया, 7/153 स्वरूपनगर, कानपुर ;	IS 3450 : 1976	92-03-31
29. 1414840	सेल्फशाइन इंडस्ट्रीज, सी-10, सेन्ट्रल रोड, मरोल एमआईडीसी, अंधेरी (पू०), बम्बई-400093	IS 7834 (भाग 4) 1987	92-04-15
30. 1530236	इंडोबान मिल्स प्राइवेट्स लि०, बुढ़ाना रोड, मुजफ्फरनगर ।	IS 1547 : 1985	92-03-15

1	2	3	4
31. 1540542	कमल मेटल इंडस्ट्रीज, 201, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, जीतवाड़ा, जयपुर-302012	IS 10325 : 1989	92-04-15
32. 1545047	अनुपम प्रॉडक्ट्स प्रा० लि०, 61/2 साइट 4, साहिबाबाद, गाजियाबाद।	IS 10325 : 1989	92-03-31
33. 1547859	गोयनका इंडस्ट्रीज, पारधानकुमी डा०चाखुडी, जिला हुगली	IS 10325 : 1989	92-03-31
34. 1550545	कयात उद्योग लि०, 243 आचार्य प्रफुल्ल चन्द्र रोड, कलकत्ता-700006	IS 10339 : 1988	92-03-31
35. 1550646	जैन टिन वर्क्स 87/8, कालपी रोड, कानपुर	IS 10325 : 1989	92-03-31
36. 1553147	जैन कैमीकल्स एण्ड एलाइड इंडस्ट्रीज, 5 बी, कॉर्पोरेटिव इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, उद्योगनगर, कानपुर।	IS 10908 : 1984	92-04-15
37. 1593560	स्वदेशी एन्टरप्राइजेज एंड कैमीकल्स इंडस्ट्रीज, 26/50, बिशाना रोड, कानपुर-208001	IS 9356 : 1980	92-10-29
38. 1629554	भारत कैमीकल्स इंडस्ट्रीज प्लॉट नं० 36, फेज 1, गोम्राईडीसी एस्टेट बटवा, अहमदाबाद-382445	IS 4955 : 1982	91-11-30
39. 1695571	मनीष पेपर एंड बोर्ड मिल्स लि०, 20/8, माइट नं० 4, साहिबाबाद इंड एरिया, साहिबाबाद-201005	IS 1397 : 1967	92-05-31
40. 1696674	नारन लाल स्टोव एवं लैटर्न्स प्रा० लि०, रेशमे स्टेशन के पास, नवसारी-396445	IS 1342 : 1986	92-06-15
41. 1758569	तलवार केबल्स इंडस्ट्रीज, डी-33, फेज 1, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, एस ए एस नगर, रोपड़-160055	IS 694 : 1972	91-11-30
42. 1770761	तलवार केबल्स इंडस्ट्रीज, डी-38, फेज 1, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, एस ए एस नगर, रोपड़-160055	IS 1554 (भाग 1) : 1988	91-12-31
43. 1798480	पेट्रो कम इंडिया, 966-67, गन्नी तेलियान, नावली सिनेमा के पीछे, दिल्ली।	IS 5277 : 1978	92-02-29
44. 1826257	किसान एग्री कैमीकल्स, पो० बा० नं० 248, कोर्ट रोड, मुजफ्फरनगर-251 001	IS 562 : 1978	92-05-31
45. 1826560	गंगा धाम एन्टरप्राइजेज, 147 बी कारापक्कम गांव, पुराना महाबलीपुरम रोड, मन्नार-600018	IS 2347 : 1987	92-05-31
46. 1834256	अनुपम प्लास्टिक इंडस्ट्रीज, 21 रामबासी नगर, इंड एस्टेट, इन्दौर-452006	IS 3906 (भाग 1) : 1982	92-05-31
47. 1889387	सुप्रीम सोप कैमीकल वर्क्स	IS 285 : 1974	91-10-15

1	2	3	4
48. 1905051	हिन्दुस्तान पुलवराइजिंग मिल्स, 278 कटरा पीरान, तिलक बाजार, दिल्ली।	IS 1507: 1977	92-02-29
49. 1921554	अमर इंडस्ट्रीज, 92/93, माडल बस्ती, नई दिल्ली-110005	IS 5487: 1969	91-01-15
50. 1922051	वेनसन एग्री केमीकल्स एंड इंडस्ट्रीज, प्रा० लि०, 15 और 16, कोयम्बतूर इंड० एस्टेट, कोयम्बतूर-641021	IS 562: 1978	92-01-15
51. 1950157	रेलिस इंडिया लि०, फटिलाइजर्स एंड पेस्टीसाइड्स डिवाजन, 94, इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, पो० नं० 107, अम्बातूर, मद्रास-600058	IS 5470: 1987	92-03-15
52. 1950258	उमा इंडस्ट्रीज, 12 अमान कुलम रोड, पप्पनाई सीकन पलायम, कोयम्बतूर-641037	IS 9079: 1987	92-03-15
53. 1950561	वृन्दावन एलॉयज, जि० पीनया एंड एरिया, चौथा फेज, तुमकुर रोड, बंगलौर-560058	IS 6914: 1978	92-03-15
54. 1956674	यश केमीकल्स प्रा० लि०, बी 2/2, फेज 2, एमआइडीसी, डोमविनि, ठाणे।	IS 1065: 1989	92-03-31
55. 1957575	ब्रजवासी उद्योग, दिल्ली आनंदा बाई पास रोड, (सौख रोड) क्रॉसिंग, मथुरा।	IS 4308: 1982	92-03-31
56. 1968378	एम० के० इंजीनियर्स (विल्फा), प्रा० लि०, बी-11/76, मोहन कॉप० इंड एस्टेट, मथुरा रोड, बदरपुर, नई दिल्ली।	IS 2879: 1975	91-04-30
57. 1970365	सेन्डोज (इंडिया) लि०, श्री० सेन्डोज बांग, कोलशेट रोड, ठाणे-400607	IS 3905: 1966	92-04-30
58. 2060230	यूनिवर्सल केबल मैनुफैक्चरिंग कं, 3302, सीताराम बाजार, दिल्ली-110006	IS 694: 1977	91-12-15
59. 2081238	टक्नो वायर एंड केबल्स, 29 आनन्दनगर, रायपुर (म०प्र०)।	IS 694: 1977	92-02-15
60. 2086046	सेन्चुरी पम्पस (प्रा०) लि०, 5-1-244, हिल स्ट्रीट, सिकन्द्राबाद।	IS 8034: 1989	92-02-29
61. 2090239	शीतला एग्री इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, 21 जैपलिंग रोड, लखनऊ	IS 561: 1978	92-03-15
62. 2092849	इंडियन स्टील एंड वायर प्रॉडक्ट्स लि०, इंदिरा नगर, जमशेदपुर।	IS 1785(भाग): 1988	92-03-15
63. 2093447	अजन्ता एन्टरप्राइजेज, खसरा नं० 76, रामहोला श्री० नागलोई, नई दिल्ली-110041	IS 694: 1977	92-03-15

1	2	3	4
64. 2103121	दि एलिंगन मिल्स कं० लि०, 11/6, श्रीमती प्रभावती बागला रोड, कूपर गंज, कानपुर-208001	IS 177: 1977	92-04-15
65. 2103323	मोहसाणा टिन फैक्ट्री, 21 जीआईडीसी इंड एस्टेट, हाथवे रोड, मोहसाणा।	IS 916: 1975	92-04-15
66. 2106329	नागरथ पेन्ट्स (प्रा०) लि०, 46 फजल गंज, कानपुर-208012	IS 2074: 1979	92-04-15
67. 2106430	नागरथ पेन्ट्स (प्रा०) लि०, 46 फजल गंज कानपुर-208012	IS 2339: 1968	92-04-15
68. 2106531	नागरथ पेन्ट्स (प्रा०) लि०, 46 फजल गंज कानपुर-208012	IS 133: 1975	92-04-15
69. 2106632	नागरथ पेन्ट्स (प्रा०) लि०, 46 फजल गंज, कानपुर-208012	IS 524: 1983	92-04-15
70. 2117031	गुप्ता कैमीकल्स, भुखमारिया बिल्डिंग, पहला तल, श्री जी की मोरी के सामने, त्रिपोलिया बाजार, जयपुर-302001	IS 7121: 1978	92-05-15
71. 2117132	गुप्ता कैमीकल्स, भुखमारिया बिल्डिंग पहला तल, श्री जी की मोरी के सामने, त्रिपोलिया बाजार, जयपुर-302001	IS 7122: 1984	92-05-15
72. 2193653	मरकपुरियम सिरदो इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, बी आई टी मितरा, रोबी-835218	IS 6639: 1972	92-01-31
73. 2195253	शिवालिक एप्रो कैमीकल्स बी-59 फेज 7, इंडस्ट्रियल फोकल प्वाइंट, एम ए एस नगर-160051	IS 12016: 1987	92-02-15
74. 2204329	श्री कृष्ण टिन फैक्ट्री, माजदेवी नेट, आऊटसाइट, जूनागढ़।	IS 10325: 1989	92-02-29
75. 2216235	पंजाब आयरन एंड स्टील कं० प्रा० लि०, जी०टी०रोड, जालंधर छावनी-144010	IS 226: 1975	92-03-31
76. 2216639	गुप्ता कैमीकल्स प्रा० लि०, भुखमारिया बिल्डिंग, पहला तल, श्री जी की मोरी के सामने, त्रिपोलिया बाजार, जयपुर-302001	IS 8023: 1987	92-03-31
77. 2222129	क्रियटा आइसक्रीम लि०, 296 जीआईडीसी औद्योगिक, अहमदाबाद-382415	IS 2802: 1984	92-03-31
78. 2224638	चांद फाउन्ड्री और आयरन वर्क्स (रजि०), अलीवाल रोड, बटाला, जिला गुरदासपुर, (पंजाब)	IS 5455: 1969	92-03-31
79. 2286039	भूपेन्द्र स्टील्स प्रा० लि० प्लॉट नं० 25, सेक्टर 6, फरीदाबाद (हरियाणा-121006)	IS 226: 1975	92-04-15

MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES, CONSUMER AFFAIRS & PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1992

S.O. 2762, In pursuance of Sub-regulation (6) of Regulation 5 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations, 1988, it is, hereby notified that the Certification Marks Licences, details of which are mentioned in the following Schedule, have expired:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No.	Name of the licensee	Number of the relevant Indian Standard	Date of expiry
1		2	3	4
1.	0025117	Krishnaveni Ink Factory, 751, Thiruvottiyur High Road, Madras-600081	IS 1221 : 1971	91/12/31
2.	0121012	Annapurna Biscuit Mfg. Co. 84/67, G.T. Road, Kanpur-208003	IS 1011 : 1981	92/02/15
3.	0244230	Vensons Agro Chemicals & Allied Inds. Pvt. Ltd., 15 & 16 Coimbatore Pvt. Indl. Estate, Coimbatore-641021	IS 561 : 1978	92/01/15
4.	0377451	Rallis India Ltd., Railli House, 21, Damodardas Sukhadwala Mg. Fort, Bombay-400001	IS 5281 : 1979	92/03/31
5.	0504432	Penta Chem. 20/23, Industrial Estate, Kedgaon, Ahmednagar-414001 (M.S.)	IS 561 : 1978	92/04/30
6.	0532437	Krishi Rasayan, Large Industrial Estate, R.K. Ashram, Muzaffarpur-843116	IS 2567 : 1978	92/03/15
7.	0356344	Rallis India Ltd., (Fertilizers & Pesticides Divn.) Railli House, 21, Raveline Street, Fort, Bombay-400001	IS 2682 : 1984	92/03/31
8.	0563145	Gupta Chemicals Pvt. Ltd., Bhukmaria Building, 1st Floor, Opp. Shri Ji Ki Mori, Tripolia Bazar, Jaipur-302001	IS 1308 : 1984	92/04/30
9.	0672554	Bir Engg. Works (Regd.), G.T. Road, Maksoodan, Jalandhar-144008	IS 780 : 1984	92/01/31

1	2	3	4
10. 0678364	The Palani Andavar Cotton & Synthetic Spg. Mills. Ltd., 236/1, Dhally Road, Udamalpet-642126	IS 834 : 1985	92/02/29
11. 0721541	Universal Industries and Cotton Mills Ltd. 9/1, R.N. Mukherjee Road, Calcutta-700001	IS 6914 : 1978	92/03/15
12. 0721642	Universal Industries and Cotton Mills Ltd. 9/1, R.N. Mukherjee Road, Calcutta-700001	IS 6915 : 1978	92/03/15
13. 0758362	Swadeshi Enterprise & Chemical Industries 26/50, Bishana Road, Kanpur-208001	IS 561 : 1978	92/02/29
14. 0870255	Alliance Mills (Lessees) Pvt. Ltd. 1, Netaj Subhas Road, Calcutta-700001	IS 1943 : 1964	92/03/31
15. 0918156	Gupta Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. Bhukmaria Building 1st Floor, Opp. Shri Ji Ki Mori, Tripolia Bazar, Jaipur-302001	IS 2568 : 1978	92/04/30
16. 1142126	Krishi Rasayan, Large Industrial Estate R.K. Ashram, Muzaffarpur-843 116	IS 632 : 1978	92/03/15
17. 1183 039	Hindustan Insecticides Ltd. Udyogamandal, Kerala-683501	IS 2567 : 1978	92/05/15
18. 1253943	Vishwa Chemicals W-2 , M.I.D.C., Area, Hingna Road, Nagpur-440016	IS 9825 : 1981	90/12/15
19. 1255139	Quick Print Industries 7/153, Swarup Nagar, Kanpur	IS 868 : 1956	92/03/31
20. 1265950	Sri Lakshmi Pa-nts & Varn'ish Works, B-3, Indl. Estate, Guntur	IS 123 : 1962	92/01/15
21. 1273848	Swadeshi Enterprise & Chemical Industries 26/50, Bishana Road, Kanpur-208001	IS 562 : 1978	92/02/29
22. 1308841	Shrihap Chemical Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. 36/37, Industrial Area Ujjain Road, Dewas-455001	IS 4984 : 1987	92/04/30
23. 1313026	Kissan Agro Chemicals, P.B. No. 248, Court Road, Muzaffarnagar-251001	IS 4323 : 1980	92/05/31
24. 1361643	Dhruv Pesticides 15, Habib Manzil Road, No. 1, Idgah Hills, Bhopal.	IS 562 : 1978	92/03/31
25. 1362645	Swadeshi Enterprise & Chemical Industries 26/50, Bishana Road, Kanpur-208001	IS 3903 : 1984	92/02/29

1	2	3	4
26. 1383855	Flamma Appliance Manufacturing Industries Patel Estate Pratapnagar, Baroda-390004	IS 4246 : 1984	92/02/29
27. 1394254	Hanut Sales Corpn. 140, Industrial Area, Jhotwara Jaipur-302012	IS 10325 : 1989	92/03/31
28. 1404029	Carbon India 7/153, Swardoop Nagar, Kanpur	IS 3450 : 1976	92/03/31
29. 1414840	Selfshine Industries C-10, Central Road, Marol MIDC Andheri (E) Bombay-400093	IS 7834(Part 4)- 1987	92/04/15
30. 1530236	Indodan Milk Products Ltd. Budhana Road, Muzaffarnagar.	IS 1547 : 1985	92/03/31
31. 1540542	Kamal Metal Industries 201, Industrial Area Jhotwara, Jaipur-302012	IS 10325 : 1989	92/04/15
32. 1545047	Anupam Products Pvt. Ltd. 62/2, Site IV Sahibabad, Ghaziabad.	IS 10325 : 1989	92/03/31
33. 1547859	Goenka Industries Par Dankumi P.O. Chakundi, Distt. Hooghly	IS 10325 : 1989	92/03/31
34. 1550545	Kayan Udyog Ltd. 243, Acharya Profulla Chandra Road, Calcutta-700006	IS 10339 : 1989	92/03/31
35. 1550646	Jain Tin Works 87/8, Kalpi Road, Kanpur	IS 10325 : 1989	92/03/31
36. 1553147	Jain Chemicals & Allied Inds. 5B, Co-operative Indl. Estate Udyognagar, Kanpur	IS 10908 : 1984	92/04/15
37. 1583560	Swadeshi Enterprise & Chemical Industries 26/50, Bishana Road, Kanpur-208001	IS 9356 : 1980	92/02/29
38. 1627554	Bharat Chemical Industries Plot No. 56, Phase-I GIDC Estate, Vatva Ahmedabad-382445	IS 4955 : 1982	91/11/30
39. 1695571	Manish Paper & Board Mills Ltd. 20/8, Site No. 4 Sahibabad Indl. Area, Sahibabad-201005	IS 1397 : 1967	92/05/31
40. 1696674	Naran Lala Stoves & Lanterns Pvt. Ltd. Near Railway Station Navsari-396445	IS 1342 : 1986	92/06/15
41. 1758569	Talwar Cable Industries D-33, Phase-I Industrial Area SAS Nagar Ropar-160055	IS 694 : 1977	91/11/30

1	2	3	4
42. 1770761	Talwar Cable Industries D-33, Phase-I, Industrial Area, SAS Nagar, Ropar-160055	IS 1554(Part-1) : 1988	91/12/31
43. 1798480	Pesto Chem. India 966-67, Gali Telian, Behind Novelty Cinema, Delhi	IS 5277 : 1978	92/02/29
44. 1826257	Kissan Agro Chemicals P.B. No. 248, Court Road, Muzaffarnagar-251001	IS 562 : 1978	92/05/31
45. 1826560	Ganga Dharam Enterprises 147 B, Karapakkam Village, Old Mahablipuram Road, Madras-600018	IS 2347 : 1987	92/05/31
46. 1834256	Anupam Plastic Industries 21, Rambali Nagar Indl. Estate, Indore-452006	IS 3906(Part 1) : 1982	92/05/31
47. 1889887	Supreme Soap & Chemical Works	IS 285 : 1974	91/10/15
48. 1905051	Hindustan Pulverising Mills 278, Katra Peran Tilak Bazar, Delhi.	IS 1507 : 1977	92/02/29
49. 1921554	Amar Industries 92/93, Model Basti, New Delhi-110005	IS 5487 : 1969	91/01/15
50. 1922051	Vonsons Agro Chemicals & Allied Inds. Pvt. Ltd. 15 & 16, Coimbatore Pvt. Indl. Estate, Coimbatore -641021	IS 562 : 1978	92/01/15
51. 1950157	Rallis India Ltd. Fertilizers & Pesticides Divn. 94, Industrial Estate, P.O. Box No. 107, Ambattur, Madras-600058.	IS 5470 : 1969	92/03/15
52. 195028	Uma Industries 12, Amankulam Road, Pappanaigekkenpalayam, Coimbatore-641037	IS 9079 : 1989	92/03/15
53. 1950561	Brindavan Alloys Ltd. Peenya Indl. Area, 4th Phase, Tumkur Road, Bangalore-560058	IS 6914 : 1978	92/03/15
54. 1956674	Yash Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. B 2/2, Phase-II MIDC Dombivali Thane	IS 1065 : 1989	92/03/31
55. 1957575	Brijbasi Udyog Delhi Agra By pass Road, (Sonkh Road) Crossing, Mathura	IS 4308 : 1982	92/03/31
56. 1968378	Amkay Engineers (Delhi) Pvt. Ltd. B-11/76, Mohan Co-op. Indl. Estate, Mathura Road, Badarpur, New Delhi	IS 2879 : 1975	91/04/30
57. 1970365	Sandoz (India) Ltd. P.O. Sandoz Baug, Kolsheth Road, Thane-400607	IS 3905 : 1966	92/04/30

1	2	3	4
58. 2060230	Universal Cable Manufacturing Co. 3302, Bazar Sita Ram, Delhi-110006	IS 694 : 1977	91/12/15
59. 2081238	Techno Wire & Cables 29, Anand Nagar, Raipur (MP)	IS 694 : 1977	92/02/15
60. 2086046	Century Pumps (P) Ltd. 5-1-244, Hill Street, Secunderabad-500003	IS 8034 : 1989	92/02/29
61. 2090239	Sheetla Agro Industries (P) Ltd. 21, Japling Road, Lucknow.	IS 561 : 1978	92/03/15
62. 2092849	Indian Steel & Wire Products Ltd. Indra Nagar, Jamshedpur.	IS 1785(Part-1):1983	92/03/15
63. 2093447	Ajanta Enterprises, Khasra No. 76, Village Ramhola, P.O. Nangloi, New Delhi-110041.	IS 694 : 1977	92/03/31
64. 2103121	The Elgin Mills Co. Ltd. 11/6, Shrimati Parbati Bagla Rd. Cooper Ganj, Kanpur-208001	IS 177 : 1977	92/04/15
65. 2103323	Mehsana Tin Factory 21, GIDC Indl. Estate, Highway Road, Mehsana-384002	IS 916 : 1975	92/04/15
66. 2106329	Nagrath Paints (P) Ltd. 46, Fajal Ganj, Kanpur-208012	IS 2074 : 1979	92/04/15
67. 2106430	Nagrath Paints (P) Ltd. 46, Fajal Ganj, Kanpur-208012	IS 2339 : 1963	92/04/15
68. 2106531	Nagrath Paints (P) Ltd. 46, Fajal Ganj, Kanpur-208012.	IS 133 : 1975	92/04/15
69. 2106632	Nagrath Paints (P) Ltd. 46, Fajal Ganj, Kanpur-208012.	IS 524 : 1983	92/04/15
70. 2117031	Gupta Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. Bhukmaria Building, Ist Floor, Opp. Shri Ji Ki Mori, Tripolia Bazar, Jaipur-302001	IS 7121 : 1973	92/05/15
71. 2117132	Gupta Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. Bhukmaria Building, Ist Floor, Opp. Shri Ji Ki Mori, Tripolia Bazar, Jaipur-302001.	IS 7122 : 1984	92/05/15
72. 2193653	Mercurium, Sirdo Industrial Estate, B.I.T., Mesra, Ranchi-835215.	IS 6639 : 1972	92/01/31
73. 2195253	Shivalik Agro Chemicals, B-59, Phase-VII, Industrial Focal Point, Sas Nagar-160051	IS 12016 : 1987	92/02/15
74. 2204329	Shree Krishna Tin Factory Outside Majevedi Gate, Junagadh	IS 10325 : 1989	92/02/29

1	2	3	4
75 2216235	Punjab Iron and Steel Co. Pvt. Ltd. G.T. Road, Jalandhar Cantt.-144010	IS 226 : 1975	92/03/31
76 2216639	Gupta Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. Bhukmaria Building, 1st Floor, Opp. Shri Ji Ki Mori, Tripolia Bazar, Jaipur-302001.	IS 8028 : 1987	92/03/31
77 2222129	Creata Icecream Ltd. 296, GIDC, Odhav Ahmedabad-382415.	IS 2802 : 1964	92/03/31
78 2224638	Chand Foundry & Iron Works (Regd.) Aliwal Road, Batala, Distt. Gurdaspur(PB)	IS 5455 : 1969	92/03/31
79 2236039	Bhupendra Steels Pvt. Ltd. Plot No. 25, Sector-6, Faridabad (Haryana)-121006	IS 226 : 1975	92/04/15

[No. CMD/13 : 14]

N. SRINIVASAN, Addl. Director General.

खाद्य मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 1992

का.सा. 2763.—पूर्व कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय (खाद्य विभाग) के आदेश सं. 52/1/79-एफ०सी०-3 (भाग-3) दिनांक 6-9-1979 की सं. सं. 62 पर प्रविष्टि को निम्नानुसार पढ़ा जाए :—

क्रम. सं.	अधिकारी/ कर्मचारी का नाम	केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधीन स्थायी पद	स्वान्तरण के समय केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधीन धारित पद	भारतीय खाद्य निगम में स्वान्तरण की तारीख
62	श्री शिव शंकर सिंह	तौल निपिक	कनिष्ठ गोदाम रक्षक	1-3-1969

[सं. ए-38022/1/91-एफ.सी.-3]

स.ना. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FOOD

New Delhi, the 6th August, 1992.

S.O. 2762 :—The entry at Sl. No. 62 of the erstwhile Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Deptt. of Food) order No. 52/1/77—FC.III (Vol. III) dated 6-9-1979 may please be read as follows :—

Sl. No.	Name of Officer/Employee	Permanent post held Under Central Govt.	Post held under the Central Govt. at the time of transfer	Date of transfer to the FCI
62.	Shri Sheo Shanker Singh	Weighment Clerk	Junior Godown Keeper	1-3-69

[No. A-38022/1/91—FC-III]

S.N. GUPTA, Under Secy,

इलेक्ट्रॉनिकी विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 8 अक्टूबर, 1992

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS

New Delhi, the 8th October, 1992

का.आ. 2764:—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में एतद्वारा इलेक्ट्रॉनिकी विभाग के मोहाली (पंजाब) स्थित इलेक्ट्रॉनिकी परीक्षण तथा विकास केन्द्र नामक अधीनस्थ कार्यालय, जिसके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यवाहक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिक सूचित करती है।

[स. 7(1) 92-हि.प्र.]
शांति लाल सर्णोट, निदेशक

S.O. 2764.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the (Mohali) Office of the Electronics Test and Development Centre, (Mohali) a subordinate office of the Department of Electronics, whereof more than 80 per cent staff have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. 7(1)/92-H.S.]

S. L. SARNOT, Director

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 16 सितम्बर, 1992

का.आ. 2765:—भारत सरकार के सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय के प्रादेश संस्था का.आ. 3792, दिनांक 2 दिसम्बर, 1966 की प्रथम अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट प्रत्येक अधिनियम के उपबंध के अन्तर्गत जारी निर्देशों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई की सिफारिशों पर विचार करने के उपरान्त, संलग्न अनुसूची के कालम 2 में विनिर्दिष्ट फिल्मों का, जिसका/जिनका विवरण उपर्युक्त अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया गया है, उसके/उनके सभी भाषा रूपांतरों के साथ स्वीकार करती है। (1-10-91 से 23-7-92 तक अनुमोदित फिल्में)।

अनुसूची

क्र.सं.	फिल्म का शीर्षक	फिल्म की लंबाई (मीटर में)	आवेदनकर्ता का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	संक्षेप या रेखा कि क्या फिल्म वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शैक्षिक उद्देश्यों के लिए है या समाचारों और सम-सामयिक घटनाओं से संबंधित फिल्म है या वृत्तचित्र है
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	सबिस टू बीकर सेकशन्स	140.00	श्री गुरुशेखर एस. ब्रेवाल	मेसर्स अवि फिल्मस एंटरप्राइज	सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित तथा डाक्यूमेंटरी के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
2.	प्रो-ओलम्पिक फुटबाल गेम्स	365.85	आन्ध्र प्रदेश फिल्म विकास निगम	आन्ध्र प्रदेश फिल्म विकास निगम	आन्ध्र प्रदेश मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के अजीन वर्गीकृत।
3.	गंगा	27.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 दैवर रोड, बम्बई-400026		सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित एवं डाक्यूमेंटरी के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
4.	न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 208-ए	532.00	—तदैव—		—तदैव—
5.	कुंभ के लिए	28.00	—तदैव—		—तदैव—
6.	नेशनल इंटीग्रेशन प्लेज	56.00	—तदैव—		—तदैव—
7.	करिमा	585.00	—तदैव—		—तदैव—
8.	दि लास्ट ड्राप	77.00	—तदैव—		—तदैव—
9.	सर्विस अवर्ग फ्रीड	524.00	—तदैव—		—तदैव—
10.	दि प्रीशियस	76.50	—तदैव—		—तदैव—
11.	छोटी छोटी बातें	—	—तदैव—		—तदैव—
12.	न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 209	303.00	—तदैव—		"समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं के रूप में सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
13.	न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 210	284.00	—तदैव—		—तदैव—

1	2	3	4	5	6
14. रैनबो	75.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पेडर रोड, बम्बई-400026			"डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
15. पूर्वजलि भाग-1	579.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
16. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 211	510.00	-तदैव-			समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं के रूप में सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
17. पूर्वजलि भाग-2	588.00	-तदैव-			"डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
18. पूर्वजलि भाग-3	587.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
19. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 208 (फोक्स आन कालाहंडी)	433.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
20. महिती चित्र नं. 505	228.60	गुजरात सरकार, गांधी नगर			गुजरात मंडल में समाचार एवं सम-सामयिक घटनाओं के रूप में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
21. महाराष्ट्र समाचार क्रमांक 457	212.00	महाराष्ट्र सरकार, बम्बई-20			महाराष्ट्र मंडल में "समाचार एवं समसामयिक" घटनाओं के रूप में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
22. वनोत्पी	297.18	-तदैव-			महाराष्ट्र मंडल में डाक्यूमेंटरी के रूप में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
23. दातांतरंगिणी संख्या 178	274.39	आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य फिल्म विभाग, हैदराबाद			आन्ध्र प्रदेश मंडल में "समाचार एवं समसामयिक" घटनाओं के रूप में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
24. महाराष्ट्र समाचार क्रमांक 458	158.00	महाराष्ट्र सरकार, बम्बई			-तदैव-
25. महिती चित्र संख्या 506	182.80	गुजरात सरकार, गांधी नगर			गुजरात मंडल में समाचार एवं सम-सामयिक घटनाओं के रूप में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
26. बाग फूलो फलों जबाब्बा	490.00	महाराष्ट्र सरकार, बम्बई			महाराष्ट्र मंडल में "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
27. नर्मदा योजना (पदकारी बाग्य प्रगति)	627.89	गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर			गुजरात मंडल में "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
28. नमोमी देवो नमंदे (दि माइने टेम्पल आफ इंडिया)	600.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
29. महिती चित्र संख्या 507	222.50	गुजरात सरकार, गांधी नगर			गुजरात मंडल में "समाचार एवं सम-सामयिक घटनाओं के रूप में सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित।
30. 23वाँ भारतीय अंतर्राष्ट्रीय फिल्म सम्मेलन-यंगलीन व टेंट रेजर	303.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पेडर रोड, बम्बई-400026			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित तथा "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
31. क्लाइड मैन टूटेक: थप पोस्ट्री	280.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
32. हे सारुटा आने अस्टा	311.00	निदेशक, औद्योगिक सुरक्षा और स्वास्थ्य, महाराष्ट्र राज्य वाणिज्य केन्द्र, तारसेव, बम्बई-1000341			-तदैव-
33. रत्नों से बचाव	29.30	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पेडर रोड, बम्बई-400026			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित एवं डाक्यूमेंटरी के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
34. नेक सलाह	30.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
35. समझदारी	38.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
36. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या-12	566.09	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
37. दि लेम्प इन दि नीचे भाग-1	507.77	-तदैव-			-तदैव-

1	2	3	4	5	6
38. दि लैम्प इन दि नीच भाग-2	583.08	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पेडर रोड, बम्बई-499026			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित एवं "डाक्युमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
39. इन सर्वे आफ टूरुप	178.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
40. इंट्रोडक्शन 1992	33.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
41. म्यूज मैगजीन न संख्या 213	313.00	-तदैव-			प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं" के लिए वर्गीकृत।
42. महिति चित्र संख्या 508	228.60	सूचना निदेशक गुजरात सरकार, सचिवालय, गांधीनगर-382010।			गुजरात मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
43. माता वसुंधरा	336.00	सूचना एवं जनसंपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, फिल्म केन्द्र, 68-तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-400034।			महाराष्ट्र मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्युमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
44. ध्यानीयाची ध्यानेश्वरी	573.33	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
45. टूबहंस रीयल्टी	231.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पेडर रोड, बम्बई-26।			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और डाक्युमेंटरी के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
46. दि घाई	134.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
47. म्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 215	522.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
48. उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार सं. 134	295.66	सूचना और जनसंपर्क निदेशालय, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, लखनऊ।			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और डाक्युमेंटरी के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
49. म्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 215	522.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पेडर रोड, बम्बई-26।			-तदैव-
50. उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार संख्या 134	295.66	उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, लखनऊ।			-तदैव-
51. म्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 216 (बॉयस आफ रीबोल्यूशन ऐरीज)	285.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पेडर रोड, बम्बई-26।			-तदैव-
52. मूव बिद इच अदर, दू इच अदर स्पीक	25.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
53. एक और बात	24.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पेडर रोड, बम्बई-26।			राजस्थान मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्युमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
54. थू इन्सेन्स	27.00	-तदैव-			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्युमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
55. हाट्ट टू हाट्ट	23.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
56. जेप	274.32	महाराष्ट्र सरकार, फिल्म केन्द्र, 68-तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34।			महाराष्ट्र मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और डाक्युमेंटरी के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
57. महिति चित्र संख्या 509	173.74	गुजरात सरकार गांधीनगर।			गुजरात मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं के लिए वर्गीकृत।
58. हीरा उद्योग	606.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
59. फारेस्ट फायर्स	607.77	श्री सुनील घोष, बम्बई।			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और डाक्युमेंटरी के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
60. महाराष्ट्र समाचार चित्र नं. 460	241.00	महाराष्ट्र सरकार, बम्बई।			महाराष्ट्र मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।

1	2	3	4	5	6
61. उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार संख्या 135	291.00	उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, लखनऊ			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
62. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 217	290.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पेडर रोड, बम्बई।			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
63. दि विटरेरी स्टार्म भाग-3	594.00	श्री प्रती सरदार जाफरी, बम्बई			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और डाक्यूमेंटरी के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
64. नगर जर्नी मोई वेल	608.00	गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर			गुजरात मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
65. फीटम स्टूडियो इन राजस्थान	571.20	श्री अशोक मुखर्जी, बम्बई			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
66. जामा चिट्ठी	608.00	गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर			-तदैव-
67. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 218	504.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पेडर रोड, बम्बई			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
68. आदर म्यूजियम	607.77	गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर			गुजरात मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
69. मद्रिनि चित्रसंख्या 510	167.64	-तदैव-			गुजरात में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "न्यूजरील" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
70. मिडि यात्रा	599.85	-तदैव-			गुजरात में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित एवं "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
71. सौराष्ट्र की सांख्यिक उद्योग	591.41	गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर			गुजरात में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
72. विकास की बदली महाभारत	591.65	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
73. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 219 (दि स्टोरी आफ डीन बिनेजीम)	504.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पेडर रोड, बम्बई			प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
74. रूपा मुंड	530.00	उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, लखनऊ			उत्तर प्रदेश मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
75. फेमिली बेलफेयर पीपल्स प्रोग्राम	497.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, बम्बई			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।
76. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 220	467.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पेडर रोड, बम्बई			-तदैव-
77. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 220-ए (ए ट्रिब्यूट टू नव्यजीत रे)	599.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
78. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 221 (ए ट्राइफ फार सेज)	483.00	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
79. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 222 (ए लाइफ लाइन फार प्रोमोटेरिडि)	516.33	-तदैव-			-तदैव-
80. न्यूज मैगजीन संख्या 223 (इंडिया, आइस फोरिंग फेडरेशन)	492.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पेडर रोड, बम्बई			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार और समसामयिक घटनाओं" के रूप में वर्गीकृत।

1	2	3	4	5	6
81. अमृत कुंभ	579.10	उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, लखनऊ ।			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
82. धाप ही के लिए	24.4	फिल्म प्रभाव, 24-वेडर रोड, बम्बई ।			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
83. महिती चित्र संख्या 511	207.58	गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर ।			गुजरात मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
84. ग्युज मैगजीन संख्या 224 (रिवरप्लेग पब्लिशिंग डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन सिस्टम)	483.00	फिल्म प्रभाव, 24-वेडर रोड, बम्बई			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार और समसामयिक घटनाओं" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
85. पथिकृत नितान बोस	594.62	श्री देवव्रता मुखर्जी, पश्चिम बंगाल			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
86. महाराष्ट्र समाचार प्रसारक संख्या 461	296.0	महाराष्ट्र सरकार, बम्बई			महाराष्ट्र मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
87. बेकारी	32.00	फिल्म प्रभाव, 24-वेडर रोड, बम्बई			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
88. बाह छू साल की	28.00	फिल्म प्रभाव, 24-वेडर रोड, बम्बई			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
89. ग्युज मैगजीन संख्या 225	443.00	-तदीव-			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
90. महिती चित्र संख्या 512	207.18	गुजरात सरकार गांधीनगर ।			गुजरात मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "समाचार एवं समसामयिक घटनाओं" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
91. पयविरण	29.00	श्री विजय एम भिंगाडे, मैसर्स फील्ड मार्सल, बम्बई-13			महाराष्ट्र मंडल में प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।
92. डोलेट आइज	9.00	-तदीव-			सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए अनुमोदित और "डाक्यूमेंटरी" के रूप में वर्गीकृत ।

[संख्या 315/1/92-एफ. (पी.)]

विजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING ORDER

New Delhi, the 16th September, 1992.

S.O.....276.5.....—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provisions of each of the enactments specified in the first Schedule to the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 3792 dated 2nd December, 1966 the Central Government after considering recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their language versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said Schedule pertaining to the period 1-10-1991 to 23-7-1992.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length of the film in metres	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Brief synopsis whether a scientific film or for educational purpose or a film dealing with news & current events of documentary films
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Services to Weaker Sections	140.00 metres	Shri Gurbir S. Grewal	M/s. Avi Films Enterprise	General release and classified as "Documentary".
2.	Pre-Olympic Football Games	365.85 metres	A.P. State Film Development Corporation	A.P. State Film Development Corporation	Release in AP circuit under the classification "Documentary"
3.	Ganga	27.00 metres	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-400026.		General release under the classification "Documentary".
4.	News Magazine No. 208-A	532.00 metres	-do-		-do-
5.	Kumbh Ke Liye	28.00 metres	-do-		-do-
6.	National Integration Pledge	56.00 metres	-do-		-do-
7.	Karishma	585.00 metres	-do-		-do-
8.	The Last Drop	77.00 metres	-do-		-do-
9.	Service-Our Creed	524.00 metres	-do-		-do-
10.	The Precious Drop	76.50 metres	-do-		-do-
11.	Chhoti Chhoti Baatein		-do-		-do-
12.	News Magazine No. 209	303.00 metres	-do-		General release under the classification "News & Current Events".
13.	News Magazine No. 210	284.00 metres	-do-		-do-
14.	Rainbow	75.00 metres	-do-		General release under the classification "Documentary".
15.	Poorvanjali Part-I	579.00 metres	-do-		-do-
16.	News Magazine No. 211	510.00 metres	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-400026		General release under the classification 'News & Current Events'.
17.	Poorvanjjali Part-II	588.00 metres	-do-		General release under the classification "Documentary"
18.	Poorvanjali-III	587.00 metres	-do-		-do-
19.	News Magazine No. 208 (Focus on Kaalabandi)	433.00 metres	-do-		-do-
20.	Mahiti Chitra No. 505	228.60	Government of Gujarat Gandhinagar		Release in Gujarat State under classification the 'News & Current Events'.
21.	Maharashtra Samachar Kramank-457	212.00 metres	Government of Maharashtra, Bombay-20		Release in Maharashtra circuit under the classification 'News & Current Events.'
22.	Vansheti	297.18 metres	-do-		Release in Maharashtra circuit under the classification 'Documentary'.
23.	Varta Tarangini No. 178	274.39 metres	A.P. State Film Development Corporation, Hyderabad		Release in A.P. circuit under the classification 'News & Current Events'.
24.	Maharashtra Samachar Kramank-458.	153.00 metres	Government of Maharashtra, Bombay		-do-

1	2	3	4	5
25.	Mahiti Chitra No. 506	182.80 metres	Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar	Release in Gujarat circuit under the classification "News & Current Events".
26.	Baga Phulauphal Zabanchya	490.00 metres	Government of Maharashtra, Bombay	Release in Maharashtra circuit under the classification 'Documentary'.
27.	Narmada Yojna (Padkaro Vachhe Pragati).	627.89 metres	Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar	Release in Gujarat circuit under the classification 'Documentary'.
28.	Namami Devi Narmade (The Modern Temple of India).	600.00 metres	Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar	-do-
29.	Mahiti Chitra No. 507	222.50 metres	-do-	Release in Gujarat circuit under the classification "News & Current Events".
30.	23rd IFFI-Bangalore Curtain Raiser	303.00 metres	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-400 026	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
31.	Blind Man Too Takes Up Poultry	280.00 mtr.	-do-	-do-
32.	Hey Talta Aale Asta	311.00 mtr.	Director, Industrial Safety and Health, Maharashtra, State Commerce Centre, Tardeo Bombay-400-034.	-do-
33.	Rataundhi Se Bachav	29.30 mtr.	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-400 026.	-do-
34.	Nek Salah	30.00 mtr.	-do-	-do-
35.	Samajdhari	28.00 mtr.	-do-	-do-
36.	News Magazine No. 212	566.09 mtr.	-do-	-do-
37.	The Lamp in the Niche Part I.	507.77 mtr.	-do-	-do-
38.	The Lamp in the Niche Part-II.	583.08 mtr.	-do-	-do-
39.	In Search of Truth	178.00 mtr.	-do-	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
40.	Introduction—1992	33.00 mtr.	-do-	-do-
41.	News Magazine No. 213	313.00 mtr.	-do-	Approved for release and classified as 'News & Current Events'.
42.	Mahiti Chitra No. 508	228.60 mtr.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachuvalaya, Gandhinagar-382010.	Approved for release in Gujarat circuit and classified as 'News & Current Events'.
43.	Mata Vasundhara	336.00 mtr.	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra Film Centre, 68—Tardeo Road, Bombay-400 034.	Approved for release in Maharashtra circuit and classified as 'Documentary'.
44.	Dnyaniyachi Dayaneshwari	573.33 mtr.	-do-	-do-
45.	Towards Reality	231.00 mtr.	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
46.	The Eye	134.00 mtr.	-do-	-do-
47.	News Magazine No. 215	522.00 mtr.	-do-	-do-
48.	Uttar Pradesh Samachar No. 134.	295.66 mtr.	Director of Information and Public Relations, Govt. of U.P., Lucknow.	-do-
49.	News Magazine No. 215	522.00 mtr.	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	-do-

1	2	3	4	5
50.	Uttar Pradesh Samachar No. 134.	295.66 mtr.	Government of U.P., Lucknow.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
51.	News Magazine No. 216 (Voice of Revolutionaries).	285.00 mtr.	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	-do-
52.	Move with Each Other, To Each Other Speak	25.00 mtr.	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
53.	Ek Aur Baat	24.00	-do-	Approved for release in Rajasthan Circuit and classified as 'Documentary'.
54.	Through Innocence	27.00	-do-	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
55.	Heart to Heart	23.00	-do-	-do-
56.	Zep	274.32	Govt. of Maharashtra Film Center, 68-Fardeo Road, Bombay-34.	Approved for release in Maharashtra circuit and classified as 'Documentary'.
57.	Mahiti Chitra No. 509	173.74	Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	Approved for release in Gujarat circuit and classified as 'News and Events'.
58.	Heera Udyog	606.00	-do-	-do-
59.	Forest Fires	607.77	Shri Sunil Ghosh, Bombay.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
60.	Maharashtra Samachar Chitra Kramank-460	241.00	Govt. of Maharashtra, Bombay.	Approved for release in Maharashtra circuit and classified as 'News & Events'.
61.	Uttar Pradesh Samachar No. 135.	291.06	Govt. of U.P. Lucknow.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
62.	News Magazine No. 217	290.00	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay.	Approved for general release and classified as 'News & Current Events'.
63.	The Literary Storm Part-3	594.00	Shri Ali Sardar Jafri, Bombay.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
64.	Nagar Charcha Note Vesh	608.00	Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	Approved for release in Gujarat circuit and classified as 'Documentary'.
65.	Freedom Struggle in Rajasthan.	571.20	Shri Ashis Mukherjee, Bombay.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
66.	Jasachitthi	608.00	Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
67.	News Magazine No. 218	504.09	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay.	Approved for general release and classified as 'News and Current Event'.
68.	Our Museums	607.77	Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar	Approved for release in Gujarat circuit and classified as 'Documentary'.
69.	Mahiti Chitra No. 510	167.64	-do-	Approved for release in Gujarat and classified as 'Newsreel'.

1	2	3	4	5
70.	Siddhi Yatra	599.85	Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar	Approved for release in Gujarat and classified as 'Documentary'.
71.	Saurashtra Ni Shaan-Ceramic Udyog	591.41	-do-	-do-
72.	Vikas No Yadlo-Mahasna	591.85	-do-	-do-
73.	News Magazine No. 219 (The story of ten villages).	504.00	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay.	Approved for release and classified as 'Documentary'.
74.	Roop Kund	530.03	Government of UP, Lucknow.	Approved for release in U.P. circuit and classified as 'Documentary'.
75.	Family Welfare People's Programme	493.00	Films Division, Bombay.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
76.	News Magazine No. 220	467.00	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
77.	News Magazine No. 220-A (A Tribute to Satyajit Ray)	539.00	-do-	-do-
78.	News Magazine No. 221 (A Time for Change)	493.00	-do-	-do-
79.	News Magazine No. 222 (A Life line for Prosperity).	516.33	-do-	-do-
80.	News Magazine No. 223 (India-China Forging Friendship).	492.00	-do-	Approved for general release and classified as 'News and Current Events'.
81.	Amrit Kumbha	579.10	Govt. of U.P., Lucknow.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
82.	Aap Hi Ke Liye	24.4	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay.	-do-
83.	Mahiti Chitra No. 511	207.58	Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	Approved for release in Gujarat circuit and classified as 'News & Current Events'.
84.	News Magazine No. 224 (Revamping Pb. Distribution System).	483.00	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay.	Approved for general release and classified as 'News & Current Events'.
85.	Pathikrit Nitin Bose	594.62	Shri Debabrata Mukherjee, West Bengal.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
86.	Maharashtra Samachar Kramank No. 461	296.00	Govt. of Maharashtra, Bombay.	Approved for release in Maharashtra circuit and classified as 'News & Current Events'.
87.	Bekari	32.00	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay.	Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.
88.	Baat Chhe Saal Ki	28.00	-do-	-do-
89.	News Magazine No. 225	443.00	-do-	Approved for general release and classified as 'News & Current Events'.
90.	Mahiti Chitra No. 512	207.18	Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	Approved for release in Gujarat Circuit and classified as 'News & Current Events'.

1	2	3	4	5	6
91. Parjavarana (Environment)	29.00	Shri Vijay M. Bhingarde, M/s. Field Marshal, Bombay-13.			Approved for release in Maharashtra circuit and classified as 'Documentary'.
92. Donate Eyes	9.00	-do-			Approved for general release and classified as 'Documentary'.

[No. 315/1/92-F(P)]

VIJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 सितम्बर, 1992

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, NO. 2, BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri P. D. Apshankar, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-2/20 of 1989

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Mormugao
Port Trust, Goa,

AND

Their Workman.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employer—Mr. K. J. Presswala, Advocate.

For the workman—Mr. E. O. Mendes, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Port and Docks

STATE : Goa

Bombay, the 2nd September, 1992

AWARD

The Central Government by their Order No. L-36012/2/89-IR (Misc.) dated 26-7-1989 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

"Whether the action of the management of Mormugao Port Trust, Mormugao Harbour, Goa in denying promotion to Shri Sayed Babulal as Works Maistry (Water Supply) is justified. If not, what relief is the said workman entitled to?"

The case of the workman Shri Sayed Babulal as disclosed from the Statement of Claim (Ex. 2) filed on his behalf by the General Secretary of the Goa Port and Dock Employees Union (Ex. 3), in short, is thus :

The promotion to the post of the Maistry/Maistry (Works) in the Engineering (Civil) Department of the Mormugao Port Trust is to be filled in from the eligible candidates from amongst the Highly Skilled artisans and mates. The Highly Skilled artisans are promoted from amongst the Skilled workman who in turn are selected from the semi-skilled and unskilled workman. The Executive Engineer of the Engineering (Civil) Department of the Mormugao Port Trust (M.P.T.) by his circular in January, 1971 called for the applications from the eligible candidates from regular artisans and mates to appear for the trade test for the post of Works Maistry and Shed Fitter Maistry. The workman in question Shri Sayed Babulal had applied for the said test and had even appeared before the Departmental Promotion Committee. However, due to the dispute raised by the workmen of the Mormugao Port and Railway Workers' Union the said criteria of promotion by the trade test was stopped, and the procedure of selection by seniority was adopted. In the year 1980 there were two posts of Maistry vacant, and they ought to have been given to Shri Lado Potekar and Minguel Reveredo. However, Shri Lado Potekar

का.आ. 2766.—चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) के खंड 5 के उपखंड (1) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इस मंत्रालय की (1) दिनांक 30-9-91 की सं. 809/5/91-एफ (सी), (2) दिनांक 15-5-92 की सं. 809/9/92-ए (सी) और (3) दिनांक 27-8-92 सं. 809/9/92-एफ (सी) की अधिसूचनाओं के अनुसार कानून में केन्द्र सरकार या, मुथिया नागनाथन को सुदृष्टीय फिल्म इमाणन बोर्ड की मद्रास सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में तत्काल प्रभाव से अगले आदेशों के होने तक नियुक्त करती है।

[फा.सं. 809/9/92-एफ (सी)]

एस. लक्ष्मीनारायणन, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd September, 1992

S.O. 2766.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules 1983 and in continuation of this Ministry's Notifications (i) No. 809/5/91-F(C) dated 30-9-91, (ii) No. 809/9/92-F(C) dated 15-5-92 and (iii) No. 809/9/92-F(C) dated 27-8-92, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Dr. Muthia Naganathan, as member of the Madras Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect and until further orders.

[File No. 809/9/92-F(C)]

S. LAKSHMI NARAYANAN, Jr. Secy.

श्रम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 1992

का.आ. 2767.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मोरमुगाओ पोर्ट ट्रस्ट, मोरमुगाओ, गोवा के संबंधित के सबूत नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं. 2 बाम्बे के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 28-9-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-36012/2/89-आई आर (मिस.)]

बी.एम. डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 7th October, 1992

S.O. 2767.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Mormugao Port Trust, Mormugao, Goa and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 28-9-1992.

[No. L-36012/2/89-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

refused the promotion, and as such that post ought to have been offered to the said workman Shri Babulal. However, his seniority was ignored by the M.P.T. and it was assigned to the employee junior to him, viz., Shri Kashinath Dessai. In the year 1984 again the vacancy of Maistry arose, and again it was offered to Shri Lado Poteker, who again refused to accept it, and even at that time the seniority of the said workman was ignored, and that post was assigned to Shri Roque L. Gonsalves. Even in 1987 one such vacancy arose, and even at that time the seniority of the workman in question was denied, and the promotion was given to the employee junior to the said workman, viz. Shri Rohidas J. Dessai. In the year 1981 the said workman was asked to assist the Engineering Assistant in charge of works at the site of 'C' shed, which normally would have been done by the works Maistry. As the seniority of the said workman was ignored, he made the necessary representations to the management of the M.P.T. However, his request was not granted by the management. Hence the conciliation proceedings were held by the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central). As the conciliation proceedings ended in failure, the Central Government made the reference, as above. It was, therefore, lastly prayed on behalf of the workman, that the workman Shri Sayed Babulal be given the promotion of the post of Maistry w.e.f. 1980 along with the necessary back wages, and his seniority be restored.

3. The M.P.T. by their Written Statement (Ex. 3) opposed the said claim of the Union, and in substance contended thus :—

In the M.P.T. there are two types of Maistry, viz., the Works Maistry and the Maistry (trade). The post of the Maistry (trade) is also known as Maistry only. The works Maistry is a Maistry who supervises the work in general, and not of any particular trade. The qualification for the post of the works Maistry is the experience of 10 years of general supervision. Maistry (trade) is a Maistry who supervises the works of a particular trade, such as, painting work, carpentry work, or Blacksmith work or Mason work etc. The eligibility for this post of Maistry (trade) is the experience of 5 years as a Highly skilled artisan in the particular trade in which the vacancy arose, e.g. if the post of a Maistry to supervise carpentry works falls vacant, the senior most highly skilled artisan having not less than 5 years experience in that trade, namely, carpenters, will be promoted to the post of Maistry (Carpentry) even though there may be other highly skilled artisans in trade other than carpentry with not less than 5 years experience, who may be senior to the person selected. These senior persons are not eligible for promotion to the post of Maistry (Carpentry) if they are the highly skilled artisans in trades other than that of carpentry. It is in these circumstances that the persons who were junior to the workman Shri Sayed Babulal were promoted as the vacancies that had occurred, were vacancies in the post of Maistry other than the Maistry (Painting). At present i.e. in January, 1989, there is one Maistry Shri S. S. More, who holds the post of a Maistry supervising the painting work, and on his retirement, the workman Shri Sayed Babulal will be entitled to promotion to that post. In response to the representations made by the workman Shri Sayed Babulal through his union, the M.P.T. requested the Central Government to sanction the creation of an additional post of Maistry (Painting). In case the necessary sanction is received from the Central Government, the new post of Maistry (Painting) will be created, and it will be assigned to the workman in question, provided he meets the other requirements of the Recruitment Rules. The said workman is not entitled to claim the promotion as claimed by him w.e.f. 1980, till we give him the promotion in the circumstances mentioned above. The M.P.T. management, therefore, lastly prayed for the rejection of the prayer of the workman.

4. The Issues framed at Ex. 4 are :

- (1) Whether the action of the management of Mormugao Port Trust, Mormugao Harbour, Goa in denying promotion to Shri Sayed Babulal as Works Maistry (Water Supply) is justified ?
- (2) If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled ?
- (3) What Award ?

5. My findings on the said issues are :

- (1) Yes,
- (2) Nil.
- (3) As per Award below.

REASONS

6. Issues No. 1 and 2.

The workman in question Shri Sayed Babulal filed his affidavit (Ex. 5) in support of his case, and he was cross-examined on behalf of the M.P.T. Management. In his cross-examination he admitted and stated that he joined the service in 1961 as Extra Labour Requisition employee, that his regular appointment in the M.P.T. was as a Painter in February, 1965, and that at present, i.e. in October, 1990, he is working as a Highly skilled painter. Shri G. B. Kulkarni, the Deputy Chief Engineer, in the Civil Engineering Department of the M.P.T. filed his affidavit (Ex. 8) in support of the case of the M.P.T. In substance, he stated in his affidavit thus :

"In the M.P.T. there are two types of Maistry, viz., Works Maistry and Maistry (trade). The works Maistry is a Maistry who supervises the works in general and not the work of any particular trade. The Maistry (trade) supervises the work of a particular trade, viz. Painter, Fitter etc. The promotion to the post of a Maistry (trade) can only be made from amongst the highly skilled artisans who are highly skilled in that particular trade. For example the promotion to the post of Maistry (Carpenter) can only be made from the post of Highly skilled Carpenters. Thus although the workman in question Shri Sayed Babulal was senior to some other employees who were appointed to the post of Maistry, Mr. Sayed Babulal could not be promoted, as the vacancy in the post of Maistry was other than Maistry (Painter), Shri Sayed Babulal is a Highly skilled artisan in painting. Hence he cannot be promoted to the post of Maistry (Water Supply) (regarding which post the present reference has been made by the Government). As no vacancy for the post of Maistry (Painter) arose till then, the said workman could not be promoted to that post. The allegation and the statements of the workman that the post of Maistry has always been filled in by common seniority from amongst the highly skilled artisans and in any posting available, is not true and correct. The workman has claimed the promotion to the post of Maistry (Water Supply), while he is a highly skilled artisan in painting. However, the Maistry (Water supply) is to be highly experienced and proficient in all the Works of Water supply section, to guide the Assistant Fitter (Water Supply), and highly skilled fitters (Water Supply) in their work, and he himself is to perform the specialised work pertaining to the water supply and sanitary installations. The said workman was appointed as a painter on regular basis in 1965. In 1973 he was promoted to the post of highly skilled painter. During the last many years he has acquired proficiency and experience only in the work of painting, and has not been exposed to any other trade at any time in his service career with the M.P.T. so far. Therefore, a highly skilled painter cannot carry out the work in the Central Water Supply section of the Engineering (Civil) Department as Maistry (Water Supply). The post of Maistry (Water Supply) has been created in the M.P.T. since 1987. The said workman has claimed the promotion to the post of works Maistry (Water Supply). However, no post of works Maistry (Water Supply) exists in the M.P.T. and as such, there is no question of giving

any promotion to the post of works Maistry (Water Supply). The senior most highly skilled fitter (Water supply) only could be promoted to the post of Maistry (Water Supply) and as such the action of the M.P.T. in denying the promotion to the post of Maistry (Water Supply) to the said workman highly skilled painter is quite just and proper."

7. I see no reason to disbelieve any of the said statements made by the responsible officer of the M.P.T. in his affidavit as above. It is thus quite clear that the workman was working as a highly skilled artisan in painting, and he had not done any work in the water supply department at any time. Therefore, even though he was senior as highly skilled artisan in painting, he could not be promoted to the post of Maistry (Water Supply), and the employees junior to him who were skilled artisans in the water supply department, could only be promoted to the post of Maistry (Water Supply). Apart from that, now the M.P.T. has already promoted the said workman Shri Sayed Babulal by the order dated 29-10-1991 (Ex. 13), the senior highly skilled painter, to the post of the Maistry. Therefore, the said workman has now also got the promotion to the post of Maistry (painting) since October, 1991. Therefore, he cannot claim the promotion to the post of Maistry (Water Supply).

8. According to the M.P.T. management the contention of the workmen's union that since 1971, the promotion used to be made by common seniority, is not true and correct. According to the M.P.T. management, a promotion to the post of Maistry (trade) can only be made from the highly skilled artisans in that particular trade. I accept this contention of the management.

Therefore, for the reasons mentioned above, the action of the M.P.T. management in denying the promotion to Shri Sayed Babulal as the works Maistry (Water Supply) is quite just, proper, and legal.

Issue No. 1 is, therefore, found in the affirmative.

As such, the said workman is not entitled to any relief. Issue No. 2 is found accordingly:

The following award is, therefore, passed.

AWARD

"The action of the management of Mormugao Port Trust, Mormugao Harbour, Goa in denying promotion to Shri Sayed Babulal as Works Maistry (Water Supply) is just, proper and legal.

The parties to bear their own costs of this reference.

Dated : 2-9-1992.

P. D. APSHANKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 1992

का.आ. 2768—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार में पुरोत्तम दास, सापुतानी एंड कं. (प्रा.) लि. बांधवे के प्रबंध तंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निरदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं. 2 बांधवे के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 28-9-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-31012/2/89-आई आर (वि.स.)]

वी.एम. डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th October, 1992

S.O. 2768.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2 Bombay as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Purshotamdas Madhavani & Co. (P) Ltd, Bombay, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 28th September, 1992.

[No. L-31012/2/89-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2. BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri P. D. Apshankar, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-2/17 of 1989

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Purshotamdas Madhavani & Co. Private Limited, Bombay.

AND

Their Workman.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employer—Mr. R. S. Rai, Advocate.

For the Workman—Mr. S. R. Wagh, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Port & Docks.

STATE : Maharashtra.

Bombay, the 1st September, 1992

AWARD

The Central Government by their order No. L-31012/2/89-IR(Misc.) dated 12th June, 1989 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

"Whether the management of M/s. Purshotamdas Madhavani & Co. Pvt. Ltd., Bombay, were justified in terminating the services of Shri N. N. Momaya, Dock Clerk, w.e.f. 5th January, 1988? If not, what relief is the workman concerned entitled to?"

2. The said workman was in the employment of M/s. Purshotamdas Madhavani & Co. Pvt. Ltd., Bombay for about 30 years before the termination of his services w.e.f. 5th January, 1988. His services were terminated by the said management by the letter dated 8th January, 1988 w.e.f. 5th January, 1988 without following due process of law. Certain allegations were made against him in the letter terminating his services. Thereafter, the workman requested the management to reinstate him in service. As the management did not consider their request, the Union approached the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) for his intervention in the matter. Several meetings were held attended by the Union's and the Management's representatives. In the meeting held on 26th July, 1988, the said company agreed to reinstate the workman in service provided he was to resume his duties within a fortnight. However, thereafter when the workman approached the company for reporting for his duty, Shri M. Sundar Rajan, the Managing Director of the company refused to allow him to resume his duties. The Assistant Labour Commissioner, thereafter again tried to settle the matter mutually. However, as the conciliation proceedings ended in failure the Central Government made the reference as above.

3. The Union further alleged thus :

The said workman was in the employment of the said company for 30 years, and his past record was clean and good. As a part of his duty, the workman was supposed to complete the formalities required under the Customs Act and Bombay Port Trust Procedure on behalf of the clients of the company for clearing and forwarding the goods received from the clients of the company. The workman used to verify the markings, and whether the seal is intact. Thereafter, those packages were taken to Customs Authority for examination. In the present case when the Customs Authorities opened the packages for examination, they found "Hashish" in the packages. The Customs Authorities, therefore, arrested the workman on the alleged charge of collusion with the party (Exporter) in smuggling the 'Hashish' and by using third degree methods compelled him to confess that he colluded with one Mr. Dhanapati Thakerv Hirji and smuggled 80 cargons containing 'Hashish'. The workman was detained under COFE POSA but the High Court of Judica-

ture at Bombay, by its order dated 20th July, 1988 released him from detention.

4. The Union further alleged that the charges made by the company in their letter of termination were not at all true. It was not at all proved that the said workman was involved in smuggling of Hashish in collusion with other person. The company did not issue any charge sheet against him, nor any domestic enquiry was held against him, as required under law. The residential premises of the workman were searched by the Intelligence Officer of the Directorate of Revenue Intelligence on 7th January, 1988, but nothing incriminating was found therein. The termination of the services of the workman by the said company were unjust, improper, invalid and illegal. The Union, therefore, lastly prayed that this Tribunal should direct the company to reinstate the workman in service with full back wages and the continuity of services w.e.f. 5th January, 1988, i.e. the date of the termination of his services.

5. The Managing Director of the said company by his Written Statement (Ex. 10) contested the said claim of the Union, and in substance contended thus :

The said workman Shri N. N. Momaya was arrested by the Directorate of Revenue Intelligence in connection with the seizure of substantial quantity of Hashish of about Rs. 23 crores on 7th January, 1988. The Department of Revenue Intelligence Authorities found the said Hashish and seized the same from the export consignment of M/s. Quality Exports declared to contain jacquard cotton bed spreads. The workman admitted before the authorities that he was aware that Hashish was concealed in the consignment and he had accepted the bed spread consignment passed through the Customs safely for a reward of Rs. 10,000 for the said job. The workman was also detained under the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act on 8th March, 1988. The authorities have also filed a criminal complaint against the said workman for offences under the Customs Act, 1962, and Narcotics, Drugs and Psychotropic substances Act, 1985, in the court of the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Bombay, on 2nd May, 1988. The said criminal case has been committed to the Court of Sessions at Bombay for trial.

6. The company further contended thus :

The said workman had clearly made the confession of his offences of smuggling before the concerned authorities. As the continuation of such an employee in service would have resulted in the cancellation of the Licence issued to the company under the C.H.A. Licence Rule 1965 duly amended by Rules of C.H.A. Licence Rules 1984, the company had no alternative but to terminate the services of the said workman. On account of the involvement of the workman and his arrest by the Directorate of Revenue Intelligence Authorities in connection with the smuggling of Hashish, the company had lost confidence in him and hence the company terminated his services. Even the Customs Pass and Dock pass issued to the workman were seized and they are now in the custody of the Directorate of Revenue Intelligence, Bombay. Without such a pass being issued by the authorities concerned such a workman cannot be employed. It is not true that the workman had come to report for his duty again, as alleged by the union. It is not true that the past service record of the workman was clean and good. It is not true that the workman had given his confession because of the third degree method used by the Customs Authorities. In the circumstances of the present case, it was not necessary for the company to issue any charge sheet to the workman or to hold any domestic enquiry against him. On the basis of the confession and admission of guilt by the workman, the company was entitled to terminate his services. His continuance in services would have put the business of the company in jeopardy and would have even caused cancellation of its licence under the C.H.A. Licence Rules. The termination of the services of the workman by the company was just, proper and legal. The company, therefore, lastly prayed for the rejection of the prayer of the Union.

7. The Issues framed at Ex. 11 are :

- (1) Whether the action of the Company in terminating the services of the workman Shri N. N. Momaya is illegal, unjust and improper ?
- (2) Whether he is entitled to reinstatement in service with full back wages and continuity of service ?
- (3) What order ?

8. My findings on the said issues are :

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The widow of the deceased workman is entitled to the monetary benefits.
- (3) As per Award below.

REASONS

9. During the pendency of this reference, the said workman expired on 26th April, 1990. Therefore, he had applied before the controlling authority, i.e. the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) for the payment of gratuity amount under Section 7 of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972. The said application was opposed by the company. However, the Controlling Authority directed the company by the order dated 8th January, 1990 to pay the gratuity amount of Rs. 40,960 to the said workman within a month. However as the said workman N. N. Momaya expired on 26th April, 1990, his widow Ratnabai made an application before this Tribunal that the said amount of gratuity be paid to her as the legal heir of the deceased. Thereafter the said amount of gratuity was paid to that lady who received it for herself and on behalf of her two sons.

10. Both the parties stated that no oral evidence was to be led on their behalf. Even though the said workman expired during the pendency of this reference, the reference does not lapse, but it will have to be proceeded further as per the provisions contained in Section 10(8) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In case it is found that the dismissal of the workman was unjust and illegal, the widow of the said deceased workman would be entitled to claim the necessary back wages and the other monetary benefits. In the circumstances of the present case I find that she is entitled to the said benefits. The documentary evidence on record is thus :

11. Ex. 3 is a true copy of the letter dated 8th January, 1988 by the said company addressed to the said workman Shri N. N. Momaya, terminating his services. This letter stated that :

"This has reference to the Panchnama Report dated 7th January, 1988 wherein you have admitted before the Directorate of Revenue Intelligence that you colluded with one Mr. Dhanapati Thackersey Hirji and smuggled 80 cartons containing Hashish along with other cartons containing Jacquard Bedspreads.

This act of yours, for which you have neither our Permission nor Authority, has put us in disrespect before the Customs Authorities. This has also put us in an embarrassing situation before our clients, connections and various other Authorities. The reputation built by this Company over the years has been lost by your illegal act.

This act of yours is unpardonable, and we are therefore terminating your service with us with effect from 5th January, 1988, the day on which we came to know about your nefarious activity."

Thus, the services of the said workman were terminated by the company for his alleged gross misconduct and involvement in Customs case.

Ex. 8 is a letter dated 11th August, 1988 i.e. during the pendency of the conciliation proceedings, by the Conciliation Officer and the Assistant Labour Commissioner addressed to the Managing Director of the said Company. In this letter it was stated that in the meeting held on 16th July, 1988, it was agreed by the Managing Director Shri M. Sunder Rajan that "Please recall to the minutes of the conciliation proceedings held in the above industrial dispute on 26th July, 1988, wherein it was agreed to by you that in the event the workman Shri N. N. Momaya, whose services were terminated by you unilaterally without holding proper enquiry

or by issuing chargesheet or notice pay, etc., reports back for duty within 15 days, you will offer him employment." By this letter the Conciliation Officer advised the company to reinstate the said workman in service immediately. Thus, it is seen from the said letter that the services of the workman were terminated unilaterally and without holding any enquiry against him, and without issuing any notice or without giving the notice pay to him, and that the said Managing Director had agreed before the Conciliation Officer to reinstate the said workman in service within 15 days. Admittedly the workman was not allowed to resume his duty thereafter. According to the company, the workman had never again come to report for his duty.

12. Ex. 14 is a letter dated 19th December, 1962 by the Company to the said workman, wherein it was stated that because of the negligence and carelessness of the workman, the service record of that company with M/s. Britannia Biscuit Co. Ltd., was spoiled.

Ex. 15 is another letter dated 17th February, 1966 by the said company to the said workman stating that the said workman had unlawfully demanded and had unlawfully received the amount of Rs. 300 from a certain customer for doing certain work. Therefore, by the said letter the workman was asked to show cause why his services should not be dismissed. The said two letters are of the years 1962 and 1966, while the services of the said workman were terminated in 1988. The third letter issued to the workman on 12th May, 1983 (Ex. 29) by the said company is contrary to the said two letters. The last letter dated 12th May, 1983 addressed to the workman stated that :

"It gives us great pleasure to realise that you have completed 25 years with us. By and large your service record with us has been very clean and we compliment you for your efficient and sincere service. Naturally this alone has been the cause of your having been with us so long.

We take this opportunity in wishing you a healthy future to complete the remaining tenure of your service with us.

As has been the practice of this Company, we are sending you our gift for your excellent service and for having been with us for 25 years."

Thus, as per this letter of 1983 i.e. issued 5 years before the termination of the workman's service, the work performance of the workman was excellent and very good.

13. Ex. 30 is a copy of the statement by the said workman who was an accused in R.A. No. 14 of 1988 before the Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate 8th Court, Esplanade, Bombay. The said workman had made the statement before that court on 21-1-1988, i.e. about two weeks after the termination of his services. In substance the accused workman made the statement before the Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate thus :

"He was taken by the D.R.I. officers on the night of 5-1-1988 to their office at Colaba. About 5 to 6 officers surrounded him and started questioning him about the consignment booked by Quality Exports containing bed spreads. The workman told them that he did not know what the cartons contained. However, on going through the invoice and shipping bill furnished by Quality Exports, he came to know that the said cartons contained bed spread. The officers of the D.R.I. then told the workman that the consignment seized by them contained Hashish in some of the Cartons. Hence the workman said that he was unaware of the contents of the cartons. They then started to assault him mercilessly. One of the officers hit him on both his legs with a horse shoe and the other officer gave him fist blows on his face and on the right ear. Some other officers started pulling his hair, and shaking his head continuously so much so that he felt giddy. He was beaten on his back and all over his body. This continued for the whole night 5-1-1988 and for the whole of the day and night of 6-1-1988. On 7-1-1988 when he was remanded to the Jail Custody he complained to the Jail authorities and he was admitted to the Jail hospital on 8-1-1988."

The said workman was examined by the Chief Medical Officer of the Bombay Central Prison Office, Bombay-11, on 11-1-1988 and the necessary medical report (Ex. 3) is thus :

"The said workman patient had given the alleged history of assault upon him on 6-1-1988 before the Medical Officer."

It is seen from that Medical certificate that the abrasions and Contusions were noticed on both the legs of the workman and those injuries can be caused by a rough and hard substance. Those injuries appeared about 4 to 5 days old. According to the company, the said workman had made certain statement admitting and confession his guilt before the Customs Authorities on 7-1-1988 and on the basis of that confession, the company had terminated his services. However, it will be seen from the lengthy statement made by the said workman accused before the Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate (Ex. 30) that he had alleged and stated that he was severely beaten by certain officers on 5th and 6th of January, 1988. Further, as noted above the abrasions and Contusions were noticed on the person of the said workman when he was examined by the Medical Officer on 11-1-1988, and those injuries appeared about 4 to 5 days old. It is thus quite clear that the said workman accused had not voluntarily made any confession before the officers concerned, but that the alleged confession was obtained from him under threats and assault upon him by the officers concerned. As such, the termination of the services of the workman based upon that alleged confession of guilt is not just, proper, and valid. According to the company Management, the said workman had made a statement in the Panchanama on 7-1-1988, and that statement was thus :

"Thereafter another person who gave his name as Navinchand Narshi Momaya alias Navinbhai entered the room. He identified Dhanpati Thackarsey Hirji and stated that Dhanpati offered him a reward and thus lured him into attempting to the smuggling of 80 cartons containing Hashish contraband. Dhanpati himself brought the 80 cartons containing the Hashish in a truck to the docks and Dhanpati was present during the examination of contraband stuffing the container r/o the export cargo of Quality Exports. Both Navinbhai and Dhanpati put their signatures below."

However, for the reasons stated above, there is reasons to believe that the said workman had not made that statement voluntarily, but that it was obtained from him under force and compulsion and by threats and assault upon him. Therefore, it was not proper on the part of the management to rely upon that confessional statement, and to terminate the services of the workman. As urged on behalf of the union, the company should have firstly suspended the workman from services, should have issued the necessary chargesheet to him, should have held the necessary domestic enquiry against him, and then only if found guilty, his services should and could have been terminated by the management. However this procedure was not followed in the present case.

14. According to the management, because of the alleged mistake of the workman, they had lost confidence in him, and hence they had no alternative, but to terminate his Services. Even then, unless and opportunity was given to the workman to show cause to the proposed termination of his services on the said ground, his services could not have been validly and legally terminated. The last certificate given by the company to the workman in May 1983 (Ex. 29) states about his excellent performance of work, 5 years before the termination of his services. In the search of the residence of the workman taken by the Customs Officers, nothing incriminating was found therein, as can be seen from the Panchanama dated 7-1-1988 (Ex. 28). The workman was detained by the Customs Authorities under the COFEPOSA Act, but he was ordered to be released on bail by High Court, Bombay, by their order dated 20-7-1988 (Ex. 19). Section 6(b)(ii) of the Payment of Gratuity Act states that ;

"The Gratuity Payable to an employee may be wholly or partly forfeited, if the services of such employee have been terminated for any act which constitutes an offence involving moral turpitude, provided that such offence is committed by him in the course of his employment."

However, as noted above, the Controlling Authority and the Assistant Labour Commissioner had directed the company to pay the necessary gratuity amount as above to the said workman. This is a circumstance in favour of the workman. Even though the company had opposed the workman's application for getting the gratuity amount, no appeal was filed by them after the order, as above, was passed by the said authority. Thereby the company implicitly admitted that the act in question did not constitute any moral turpitude.

15. Therefore, for the different reasons mentioned above, I find that the termination, i.e. the dismissal of the workman from services by the said company was not just, proper and legal. As such the said workman was entitled to reinstatement in services. However the workman has expired on 26-4-1990. Therefore, his widow and his legal heir is entitled to claim and receive the necessary monetary benefits due from the date of the dismissal of the workman from services till his death i.e. from 5-1-1988 to 26-4-1990. She is entitled to the back wages due to the said workman of the said period, and to the other service benefits, such as, the encashment of the unavailed leave, the amounts of the bonus, and the Provident fund etc. but not to the retrenchment compensation.

Issue Nos. 1 and 2 are therefore found accordingly.

16. The following Award is, therefore, passed.

AWARD

The action of the Management of M/s. Purshotamdas Madhavani and Co. Pvt. Ltd., Bombay, was not just, proper, and legal in terminating the services of Shri N. N. Momaya, Dock Clerk, w.e.f. 5-1-1988.

However, the said workman has already expired on 26-4-1990. Therefore, the management of the said company is hereby directed to pay the amounts of the back wages due from the date of the dismissal of the said workman till the date of his death, i.e. due from 5-1-1988 to 26-4-1990, and also the amounts of the other service benefits such as the encashment of the unavailed leave, the amounts of the bonus, and provident funds etc. to his widow Smt. Ratnaben N. Momaya, the legal heir of the said deceased, within 3 months. The parties to bear their own costs of this reference.

P. D. APSHANKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 1992

का.आ. 2769—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इंडियन एयरलाइन्स हैदराबाद के प्रबन्धन के संबंध निर्योजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधि-करण, आन्ध्र प्रदेश के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7-10-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[मुद्राएँ-11011/5/87-डी II (बी)/डी-III (बी)]

बी.एम. डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th October, 1992

S.O. 2769.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Andhra Pradesh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Indian Airlines, Hyderabad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7-10-92.

[No. L-11011/5/87-D.II(B)/D.III(B)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT HYDERABAD

PRESENT :

Sri G. Krishna Rao, B.A., B.L.,
Chairman, Industrial Tribunal.

Third Day of September Nineteen Hundred Ninety two
INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 97 OF 1988

BETWEEN

The Workmen of Indian Airlines
Hyderabad.

.. PETITIONER

AND

The Management of Indian Airlines,
Hyderabad.

.. RESPONDENT

This case is coming for final hearing before me in the Presence of Sri P. Damodhar Reddy, Advocate for the Petitioner-Workman and Sarvasri R. Raghavan and C. Balaji Narayana, Advocates for the Respondent-Management and upon perusing the material Papers on record and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Court Passed the following :

AWARD

This is a reference made by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-11011/5/87-D.II(B)/D.III(B) dated 8-9-88 for adjudication on of the dispute between the Management of Indian Airlines, Hyderabad and their workmen setting forth the point for adjudication in the Schedule appended thereto as follows :

"Whether the action on the part of the management of Indian Airlines, Hyderabad in terminating the services of 18 Sweepers, whose names are listed in the Annexure, after employing them directly for the period shown against each, is fair and justifiable ?

If not, to what relief the said workmen are entitled?"

This reference is registered as Industrial Dispute No. 97 of 1988 on the file of this Tribunal. After receiving the notices both Parties put in their appearance. The Petitioner-Union filed their claim statement on 17-7-1989 and the Respondent filed their counter on 15-12-1989.

2. The averments of the Claim Statement read as follows :

The Petitioner submits that he is representing the case of the workmen engaged by the Respondent through the contractor and his Union is registered under the Trade Unions Act, and got the representative capacity to raise the industrial dispute on behalf of the members of his Union. The Petitioner submits that the management of Indian Airlines being a model employer created by the Union of India instead of regularising the services of contract labour, deprived them of their livelihood on untenable grounds. The petitioner is questioning the action of the Respondent in not providing the work and in not regularising the service of the concerned workmen at Serial No. 9. Sri P. Balaiah, 10. Sri A. S. Murthy and 11. Smt. Hamsamma. The Petitioner submits that he has submitted a demand notice dt. 15-3-1984 to the Respondent to regularise the services of all the contract workers including the concerned workmen at serial Nos. 9, 10 & 11 of the reference. The petitioner submits that when the respondent failed to settle the issue, the Union moved the Dy. Commissioner of Labour, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh (Hyderabad twin cities) by submitting a representation dt. 28-4-84 to interview in the matter and to convince the Respondent to regularise the services of the contract workers. In the meanwhile the Respondent tried to retrench the concerned workmen by serving notices through its contractors. The Petitioner submits that the Dy. Commissioner of Labour, Hyderabad twincities, Govt. of A.P. has advised him to approach the Regional Asst. Commissioner of Labour (Central), Hyderabad in this matter. The petitioner submits that he has submitted an application to the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) in the matter. The Petitioner submits that the respondent not participated in the conciliation proceedings. The Petitioner submits that the Respondent during the Pendency of the conciliation proceedings about the regularisation of the services of contract workers, deprived the concerned workmen of their livelihood as a measure of victimisation and an unfair labour practice. The Petitioner submits that the action of the management is not bonafide and the management took an arbitrary decision to dispense with the services of the concerned workman. The petitioner submits that the concerned workmen have put in considerable years of service and the respondent either in person or through its contractors failed to comply with the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 while terminating their services. The petitioner submits that Sri P. Balaiah, concerned workman at Sl. No. 9 of the reference has joined the service on 4-2-1979 as a Sweeper in the respondent establishment

through the contractor. The petitioner submits that the concerned workman at Sl. No. 9 of the reference was getting Rs. 300.00 p.m. as on the date of termination of his services. The petitioner submits that this workman i.e. Shri P. Balaiah was contributing towards Central Provident Fund and the E.S.I. and these amounts were collected by the respondent and credited the said amounts as if the concerned workman is his own employee. The petitioner submits that the Respondent being principal employer has got a legal duty to see that the contract workers are paid all the statutory benefits. The petitioner submits that Shri A. S. Murthy, concerned workman at Sl. No. 10 of the reference has joined the service of the respondent on 18-8-1978 as a Sweeper and he was also getting Rs. 300.00 p.m. as on the date of termination of his services. The petitioner submits that the Respondent in his matter also recovered the E. S. I. and P. F. contributions and sent the same to the concerned authorities under its Head of Account. The petitioner submits that the management has utilised the services of this Workman and not availed for any benefits of regularisation and the leave facilities. The petitioner submits that the concerned workman at S. No. 11 of the reference Smt. Hamsamma has joined the service of the respondent on 5-8-1978 as a Sweeper and she was getting Rs. 300.00 P.M. as on the date of termination of her services. The petitioner submits that Smt. P. Hamsamma worked continuously under the Respondent through the contractor and she too is the member of the C. P. F. and the E. S. I. benefits. The Respondent also collected the contributions from her salary and paid the same under this Head of Account of the concerned statutory authorities. The petitioner submits that the juniors to the concerned workmen at Sl. Nos. 9 to 11 are still working in the respondent establishment and most of them were regularised in the service as permanent workers. The petitioner submits that the respondent exploited the concerned workmen and the contractor has got huge amounts towards the profits. The petitioner submits that the work of Sweeper is a regular nature of work and it is not a casual work. The petitioner submits that it is the bounden duty of the Respondent being a model employer created by the welfare Government committed towards the betterment of poor and downtrodden out to have extended the benefits of regular workers to these persons also. The petitioner submits that the demand for reinstatement of the concerned workmen at Sl. Nos. 9 to 11 of the reference with continuity of service, all other attendant benefits including the full back wages and to regularise their services in the permanent cadre of the respondent is genuine, reasonable and correct in all respects. The petitioner submits that the management erred in not providing the work to the concerned workmen at S. Nos. 9 to 11 of the reference particularly when they worked continuously with the Respondent through the contractors for more than 4 years. The petitioner submits that the action of the Respondent in terminating the services of concerned workmen at S. Nos. 9 to 11 of the reference is illegal, unjust, contrary to law and against the principles of natural justice. The petitioner submits that the Respondent having exploited them for years together by arranging payment of meagre salaries, finally deprived their livelihood without any basis. The Petitioner therefore prays that this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to pass an award granting the relief of reinstatement with full back wages, continuity of service and all other attendant benefits and the benefits of regularisation with the pay scales of the permanent cadre workers to the concerned workmen at S. Nos. 9 to 11 of the reference in the above Industrial Dispute i.e. to Sri P. Balaiah, Sweeper, Sri A. S. Murthy, Sweeper and Smt. P. Hamsamma, Sweeper in the interest of justice and fair play.

3. The Respondent filed the Counter. The averments of the counter filed by the Respondent read as follows :

The Respondent denies all the allegations made in the claim statement except those which are specifically admitted herein and the petitioner is put to strict proof of all the averments made therein. At the very outset it is submitted that the reference made to this Hon'ble Industrial Tribunal is illegal and void and one without jurisdiction for the reason that the Union has no representative capacity to raise any industrial dispute if at all there is one. In other words, it is submitted that the so called petitioner union does not have a support of appreciable or substantial number of workmen. Therefore, the Petitioner union has no representative character to espouse the cause of the workmen. It is further submitted that the reference is also liable to be rejected yet another ground namely that there is no privity of contract between the employees figuring in the reference

and the respondent management. It is submitted that the management of Indian Airlines has been engaging certain sweepers through a contractor. The contract stipulated that it is the look out of the contractor to engage sweepers and to see that they are paid as per the statute. The fixation of the contract labour by the contractor is within the whole discretion and the management has no say in that regard. The Central Government exercising their power under Section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulations & Abolition) Act, 1970 abolished the contract system by virtue of which the employees who are engaged by the contractor were terminated. In view of this it is submitted that if at all the contract labour have any claim to be made which should be only against the contractor and not against the management of Indian Airlines. In pursuance of the said direction Indian Airlines continued the appointment of all the persons on casual basis (Part-time basis pending sanction of posts and regular recruitment. Later a notification dated 8-4-87 was issued for recruitment of sweepers. All the 18 persons applied for the said posts, only 15 of them satisfied the requirements and were appointed. The petitioners could not be absorbed as they did not satisfy the requirements as they were overaged, even after relaxation of age. With reference to the averments made in the claim statement assuming that the dates of engagement by the contractor given by them are correct still they could not come upto the standards laid down by the Indian Airlines with regard to age, minimum qualification etc. The other allegations that the Respondent being a public sector undertaking should automatically take all the contract labour is incorrect. According to Section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulations & Abolition) Act, 1970 the Government has got the power to abolish the contract labour system nonetheless there is no provision under the said Act where such abolition is affected the contract labour would automatically become the employees of the principal employer. Therefore the contention that the event of abolition they become the employees of Indian Airlines is contrary to law. For the above said reasons it is prayed that the Industrial Tribunal may be pleased to reject the reference as it is not maintainable and grant no relief to the three workmen.

4. W.W.1 to 3 were examined for the Petitioner and the Petitioner's side was closed. Exs. W1 and W2 were marked for the petitioner. M. W1 was examined for the Respondent and the Respondent's side was closed. Exs. M1 to M12 were marked for the Respondent.

5. The point for adjudication is whether the action on the part of the management of Indian Airlines, Hyderabad in terminating the services of 18 Sweepers, whose names are listed in the Annexure, after employing them directly for the period shown against each, is fair and justifiable? If not, to what relief the said workmen are entitled?

6. POINT : The undisputed facts in this case are that the three workmen i.e. W.W.1 to W.W.3 whose names are noted at S. Nos. 9 to 11 in the Annexure of the names of the 18 workmen appended to the reference, worked as contract labourers through the Contractors in the Respondent Airlines since 1979 in the case of W.W.2 and since 1978 in the case of W.W.1 and W.W.3 till they were removed by the Contractors in the year December, 1986 when the contract system was abolished, along with the other workmen whose names were also noted in the Annexure appended to the reference and that W.W.1 to W.W.3 were employed directly by the Respondent-Airlines as Part-Time Sweepers and they worked during the period from 20-6-1986 to 18-12-1986 and the other workmen whose names were noted in the annexure appended to the reference were also appointed as Sweepers directly by the Respondent-Airlines and they worked for different periods as noted against their names in the Annexure appended to the reference under the Respondent-Airlines and it was also not in dispute that except W.W.1 to W.W.3 all others i.e. the remaining 15 other workmen out of 18 workmen whose names were noted in the annexure appended to the reference were regularly employed by the Respondent-Airlines and they have been working under the Respondent-Airlines ever since then. So the matter remains for adjudication in this case relating only to the three workmen i.e. W.W.1 to W.W.3. The scope of the reference is only with regard to whether the action on the part of the Management of Indian Airlines, Hyderabad in terminating the services of 18 Sweepers, whose names are listed in the annexure, after employing them directly for the period shown against each, is fair and justifiable and if not, to

what relief the said workmen are entitled. So this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to go beyond the scope of the reference and it should confine to consider whether the Management of the Indian Airlines is justified in terminating the services of the workmen after employing them directly for the period shown against their names and beyond that I am of opinion that there is no scope to consider any matter in this case to find out whether prior service of the workmen under the contractors, to adjudicate whether the termination of their services by the Respondent Airlines is justified or not. There is no dispute that W.W. 1 to W.W. 3 worked as Part-time Sweepers only for the period from 26-8-1986 to 18-12-1986, having been directly appointed as Part-time Sweepers by the Respondent-Airlines after the contract system was abolished. It is contended by the learned counsel for the Petitioners that the Petitioners worked in the Respondent Airlines through the contractors since 1979 in the case of W.W. 2 and since 1978 in the case of W.W. 1 and W.W. 3 and therefore, the services rendered by them to the Respondent-Airlines through the contractor has to be taken into consideration and it should be deemed that their service under the Respondent-Airlines directly and so they are to be absorbed in the service of the Respondent-Airlines as regular employees of the Respondent-Airlines. The learned Counsel for the Respondent attacked this contention of the petitioner that there is no provision under the Contract Labour (Regulations and Abolition) Act, 1970 or under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, to say that the service rendered by the workmen through the contractor is to be deemed as service rendered by them directly under the principal employer and that they should be deemed to be the employees under the principal employer after the Contract Labour System was abolished in the particular establishment and that on the other hand such workman employed through the contract cannot be deemed to be the direct employees of the principal employer and that no rights can be accrued to them for regular appointment under the principal employer and that such matter cannot be the subject matter of the reference and it cannot be adjudicated by a court of Law. In support of his contention, the learned counsel for the Respondent Airlines cited a ruling reported in *DENA NATH v. NATIONAL FERTILIZERS LTD.*, (1) Wherein it was held :

"The Act merely regulated the employment of contract labour in certain establishment circumstances. The Act does not provide for total abolition of contract labour but it provides for abolition by the appropriate Government in appropriate cases under S. 10. It is not therefore for the Court to inquire into the question and decide whether the employment of contract labour in any process, operation or in any other work in any establishment should be abolished or not. It is a matter for the decision of the Government after considering the matter, as required to be considered under S. 10. The only consequences provided in the Act where either the principal employer or the labour contractor violates the provision of Ss. 9 and 12 respectively is the penal provision, contained in Ss. 23 and 25. Therefore, in proceedings under Art. 226 of the Constitution merely because contractor or the employer had violated any provision of the Act or the rules, the Court could not issue any mandamus for deeming the contract labour as having become the employees of the Principal employer."

AIR 1992 S.C., Page 457

The learned counsel for the Respondent also cited another ruling reported in *BURMAH SHELL CO. v. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL*, A.P. (1) wherein it was held :

"The Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act covers the entire subject of contract labour and provides protection to the labour by providing suitable remedies. The Industrial Disputes Act admittedly is a general enactment which applies to all industries and all workmen coming within its fold and every industrial dispute within the meaning of the Act, including previously the dispute relating to contract labour could be referred for adjudication under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. Out of the generality of these cases falling under the Industrial Disputes Act, the Contract Labour (Regu-

lation and Abolition) Act takes out one case of contract labour and legislates exclusively thereon. The Act therefore is a special enactment applicable only to the subject of contract labour, whether employed by a contractor or they work in an establishment. Every dispute therefore, relating to contract labour must have to be tackled only under the provisions of the Act and not under the general law. The Act therefore takes away the power of the Government which it enjoyed previously under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act to refer disputes relating to contract labour to the Industrial Tribunals. Instead, the Government can now, if they so desire, apply the provisions of the Act to such an establishment or prohibit the contract labour in any process of such establishment."

In view of the pronouncements made in the above two rulings, cited by the learned counsel for the Respondent, the workmen in the annexure appended to the reference cannot become the employees of the principal employer i.e. the Respondent Airlines and they cannot be deemed as the workmen under the Respondent Airlines after abolition of the contract system and it cannot be said that they are entitled for adjudication of the dispute with respect to their status as contract labourer in this case by this Tribunal.

(1) 1975 (1) Lab. I.C., Page 165 (A.P.)

7. In view of the scope of the reference, the workman involved in this case did not comply the continuous service of 240 days, the Respondent to comply with the mandatory provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, and to hold that they are entitled for reinstatement for non-compliance of the mandatory provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act by the Respondent-Airlines. So in view of the fact that W.W. 1 to W.W. 3 did not complete the continuous service of 240 days under the Respondent-Airlines, the provisions of Section 25-F of the I. D. Act are not attracted and therefore, I am of opinion that the three workmen namely W.W. 1 to W.W. 3 are not entitled for reinstatement into service and it cannot be held that the Respondent is not justified in terminating their services.

8. In the result, as Award is passed holding that the workmen noted in the annexure appended to the Reference are not entitled for any relief in this case and the action of the Management of Indian Airlines, Hyderabad in terminating the services of the said workmen is justified. There will be no order as to costs under the facts and circumstances of the case.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 3rd day of September, 1992.

Sd/-

G. KRISHNA RAO, Industrial Tribunal

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner,

W.W. 1 Shri A. S. Murthy,

W.W. 2 Shri P. Balaiah,

W. W. 3 Smt. P. Hamsamma.

Witnesses examined for the Respondent.
M.W. 1 Sri M. Raghu Ramaiah.

Documents marked for the Petitioner-Workman

Ex. W-1 18-9-86.—Gate pass issued by the Security Officer, Indian Airlines, Hyderabad to A. S. Murthy.

Ex. W2.—Identity Card issued by the Manager, E.S.I., Corporation to Smt. Hamsamma.

Documents marked for the Respondent-Management.

Ex. M-1 30-5-86.—Copy of the order issued by the Deputy Manager, Personnel Services, Indian Airlines with regard to appointment of Sri G. Narasimha as Sweeper.

Ex. M-2 20/26-8-86.—Copy of the appointment order issued by the Deputy Manager, Personnel Services, Indian Airlines with regard to A. S. Murthy as Sweeper.

AWARD

- Ex. M3 20/26-8-86.—Copy of the appointment order issued by the Deputy Manager, Personnel Services, Indian Airlines with regard to Smt. P. Hamsamma, as Sweeper.
- Ex. M4 20/26-8-86.—Copy of the appointment order issued by the Deputy Manager, Personnel Services, Indian Airlines with regard to Sri P. Balaiah, as Sweeper.
- Ex. M5 8-4-87.—Notification issued by the Deputy Manager, Personnel Services (P), Indian Airlines with regard to Sweeper.
- Ex. M6 29-11-87.—Copy of the proceedings of Selection Board for the post of Sweeper.
- Ex. M7 26-5-86.—Application submitted by Smt. P. Hamsamma to the Dy. Manager, Personnel Services, Indian Airlines, Hyderabad.
- Ex. M8 26-5-86.—Application submitted by A. S. Murthy to the Dy. Manager Personnel Services, Indian Airlines, Hyd.
- Ex. M9 25-5-86.—Application submitted by P. Balaiah to the Dy. Manager, Personnel Services, Indian Airlines, Hyderabad.
- Ex. M 10 7-6-86.—Photostat copy of the Medical examination certificate for Part-time Sweepers.
- Ex. M11 8-4-87.—Photostat copy of the order in W.P.M. P. No. 4255/87 in W.P. No. 3222 of 1987.
- Ex. M12 3-11-89.—Copy of the order in W.P. No. 3222/87.

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 1992

का. प्रा. 2770.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार नार्थ ईस्ट रेलवे, लखनऊ के प्रकथन के संवद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच प्रकथन में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिनियम, 1947 के अन्तर्गत को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7-10-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[एन-11012/9/88-डी-II (बी)/आई आर (कै. ग.)]

कै. पी. डी. उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th October, 1992

S.O. 2770.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of North East Railway, Lucknow and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 7-10-1992.

[No. I-41012/9/88-D.II(B)/IR(DU)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SRI ARJAN DEV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, PANDU NAGAR, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 122 of 1989

In the matter of dispute

BETWEEN

The General Secretary,
Purvottar Rly. Shramik Sangh,
6, Navin Market, Kuisarbagh,
Lucknow.

AND

Senior D.P.O.,
N.E.R. Ashok Marg,
Lucknow.

1. The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, vide its Notification No. I-41012/9/88-D-II(B) dated 19-5-1989, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal.—

Kya Senior D.P.O., Uttar Purvi Rly., Lucknow द्वारा Time Scale Khalsi Sri Kaushal Kishore suputra Sri Pckarna Ki 5-3-86 se sewan samapt karna nyayochit hai? Yadi nahi to karamkar kis amutosh ka haqqdar hai?

2. The industrial dispute on behalf of the workman has been raised by Purvottar Rly. Shramik Sangh (hereinafter referred to as the Union). The case of the Union in short is that the workman was appointed as a Khalsi in the Time Scale on 16-2-77 under P.W. 1., Sitapur. However, his services were terminated illegally w.e.f. 5-3-86 in violation of the provisions of section 25F I.D. Act, under para 32E. The Union has, therefore, prayed for his reinstatement with full back wages and all consequential benefits.

3. The case is contested by the railway management. The management plead that the workman who had been working as a Khalsi in the time scale under PW1, Sitapur, abandoned his duty w.e.f. 5-11-85, without any intimation to his superiors and without any application for leave. P.W.1. Sitapur, therefore, informed the Assistant Engineer, Sitapur about the unauthorised absence of the workman vide his letter dated 20-2-86. On 5-3-86, the Assistant Engineer, Sitapur passed an order under Rule 732-R. 1 Exception II foot note 2 that the services of the workman stood terminated automatically. The workman was thus never removed from service nor retrenched from service.

4. The management further plead that the workman after he had come to know that he had ceased to be in railway service sent a letter under registered post dated 3-3-86 to P.W.I. Sitapur, who received the same on 6-3-86. The letter was accompanied by medical certificates issued by some private medical practitioner of the period 16-12-85 to 13-1-86 and 14-1-86 to 13-3-86. P.W.I., Sitapur vide his letter dated 17-3-86 informed about it to the Assistant Engineer, Sitapur, who vide his letter dated 27-3-86 informed P.W.I. that workman had already ceased to be in service under the above-mentioned Rule. A registered letter which was sent to the workman at his home address was returned by the postal authorities with the remark that the addressee had gone to Sitapur for duty when he never turned up for duty. As such the remarks on the registered letter were procured by the workman knowingly and deliberately. The fact is that after gaining knowledge that he had ceased to be in service he procured certificates of private medical practitioners to explain his absence. It was on 15-5-86 that the workman turned up in the office of P.W.I. Sitapur for inquiry about his arrears of wages when he was informed about the order dated 5-3-1986. In the circumstances, the Union/workman has no case at all. The workman is not at all entitled to reinstatement and back wages as claimed by the Union for him.

5. In its rejoinder the Union alleges that it is wrong on the part of the management to plead that the workman had absented himself without intimation. In fact application for one day leave was left by him with mate Sri Khida on 5-11-85. The Mate, however, informed the workman that he would not be in a position to extend the leave in future and so the workman should better contact P.W.I., Sitapur, despite the fact that the workman had severe pain in his stomach he somehow managed to contact P.W.I., Sitapur, who refused to sanction any further leave to him. The workman also went to the Medical Officer Incharge, N.E.R., Sitapur, but to his ill luck no doctor was available for his treatment at the time in the hospital. So compelled by circumstances the workman had to undergo private medical treatment. The Union has further alleged that despite production of medical certificates of the private medical practitioners he was not taken on duty on 2-3-1986 when he presented himself for duty. Instead orders against him were passed on 4-3-86 under Rule 732-R.I. Therefore, it is not true that the workman had sent his registered letter dated 2/3-3-86 after knowing about the issue of letter of his termination from service. As regards the management's registered letter dated 27-3-86, the Union alleges that no such letter was ever delivered to the workman. The Union also

denies that the workman had gone to Sitapur to report for duty on 27-3-86. In the alternative the Union alleges that Rule 732-R-1, Exception II foot note 2 cannot supersede the provisions of section 25F I.D. Act. The termination of the services of the workman on account of the alleged unauthorised absence amounts to punishment of removal from service without issue of show cause notice. The order of termination is violative of Article 311(2) of the Constitution of India.

6. In support of their respective cases both sides have led oral as well as documentary evidence whereas the Union has examined the workman, the management have examined Sri G. L. Gupta, P.W.I., Sitapur.

7. The first point to be determined in this case is as to since when the workman did not turn up for duty.

8. The management have come out with the clear case in the written statement that the workman did not report for duty on 5-11-85. The management have tried to prove their case by the evidence of M.W. Sri G. L. Gupta, P.W.I., Sitapur and Ext. M.1 to M.3.

9. In para 2 of his affidavit the management witness has deposed that the workman who had been working as a khalasi in the time scale under PWI, Sitapur absconded and abandoned his duty w.e.f. 5-11-85 without any intimation to the authorities concerned and without any sanctioned leave. Ext. M.1 is the photostat copy of the casual labour card of the workman. It shows that he was absent on 5-11-85. Ext. M.2 is the copy of letter dated 17-2-86 from P.W.I., Sitapur, to the Assistant Engineer. By means of it P.W.I., Sitapur reported to the Assistant Engineer that the workman had been absent from 5-11-85 without any information. Ext. M.3 is the copy of order dated 4-3-86 of the A.E.N., Sitapur in which also the date of absence of the workman is mentioned as 5-11-85. I may state here that there is no evidence from the side of the Union to show that the management witness Sri G. L. Gupta, A.E.N. or others were prejudiced against the workman or were enmical to him.

10. As against the above evidence there is simply the bald statement of facts without stating as to since when the workman did not attend his duty and under what circumstances, he could not attend the duty in the claim statement. For the first time in the rejoinder it was alleged by the Union that because of severe pain in his stomach on 5-11-85 an application for one day's casual leave was left by the workman with the mate. There is nothing in the rejoinder to show that after availing one day's casual leave he joined the duty and worked upto 14-11-85. The Union, however, took a somersault while filing the affidavit of the workman. In the affidavit it has been deposed by the workman that he had worked till the evening of 15-11-85 when he fell ill and his illness continued thereafter. The change appears to have been made in view of the facts alleged in the workman's purported application dated 14-12-85 copy of which has been filed by the Union with the rejoinder. It is stated therein that the workman was forwarding to PWI, Sitapur the medical certificate of the private medical practitioner for the period 15-11-85 to 15-12-85.

11. Thus the Union has no consistent case to offer. Because of it I am not prepared to believe the case of the Union as set up for the first time in the affidavit of the workman and against the pleading. Rather I believe the case set up by the management which, as earlier stated by me, finds corroboration from the evidence adduced by the management.

12. The second point to be examined in this case is with regard to justification of the action taken by the management against the workman under Rule 732 Exception II foot note 2.

13. In para 2 of the reply it has been alleged by the Union that on 5-11-1985 the workman developed severe pain in his stomach. He, therefore, approached Sri Khida mate for one day's leave the same day. However, the mate told him that he would not be in a position to extend the leave and he should better meet PW 1 Sitapur for sanction of leave. On his advice he met PW 1 Sitapur for sanction of request refused to sanction him any further leave. The workman then went to the medical officer incharge N.R.R. Sitapur but to his ill luck no doctor was available in the hospital. In the circumstances he had to undergo private medical treatment.

14. It is important to note that in his entire affidavit at no place, the workman has deposed the above facts. All that has been stated by him is that from 15-11-1985 to 15-12-1985 he had been unwell and that on 15-12-1985 he made an application (to whom not stated) for permission to get himself treated from a private doctor. The treatment continued till 1-3-1986.

15. One thing that comes out from the above evidence is that according to the evidence of the Union every thing happened on 15-11-1985 and not on 5-11-1985.

16. The fact stated by the Union in para (2) of the rejoinder with regard to the alleged contacts made by the workman with the mate and P.W. 1. Sitapur and his having gone to the railway hospital for medical treatment do not find corroboration from the circumstances of the case.

17. In his cross examination the workman has deposed that on 15-11-1985, when he met P. W. 1. Sitapur, for sanction of leave, P. W. 1 Sitapur, refused to accept his leave sanctioned on the ground that leave was banned. The workman admits that against P. W. 1. Sitapur he made no complaint to any higher officer of the Railway. Document No. 3 filed with the rejoinder by the Union purports to be the photostat copy of the application dated 14-12-1985 of the workman addressed to P. W. 1. Sitapur. In the application it is stated that he is forwarding with this application a private, medical certificate regarding his illness for the period 15-11-1985 to 15-12-1985. In the application there is no mention of the facts stated in para 2 of the rejoinder on the point as to what had happened on 5-11-1985.

18. The Union has filed some documents with the rejoinder. The Union made no attempt to prove these documents either by the affidavit of the workman nor made any attempt to prove them from the workman while he was in the witness box. But this lapse on the part of the Union was got corrected by the authorised representative for the management during the course of cross-examination of the workman. With the rejoinder the Union has filed three documents which are the photostat copies of UPC medical certificate dated 15-11-1985, issued by one Dr. Chandra Kumar Bajpai of Chandra Clinic Lakhimpur Khiri and application dated 14-12-1985 of the workman addressed to PW 1 Sitapur enclosing with it a private medical certificate of the period 15-11-1985 to 15-12-1985.

19. In para 3 of his statement in cross-examination the workman has deposed that on 15-12-1985, with his application for leave he had sent a medical certificate of a private doctor of the period 15-11-1985 to 15-12-1985. However, later on he stated that it was sent under postal certificate copy of which has been filed with the rejoinder. Towards the end of his cross examination in the same para he has deposed that the copy of the application dated 14-12-1985 filed with the rejoinder was not the said application of leave. The question is where is that application and why its copy has not been filed.

20. He was also confronted with the copy of his medical certificate dated 15-11-1985, document No. 2 of the rejoinder. After seeing it he replied that he had obtained it on 15-12-85, when it bears the date 15-11-1985. He is not an illiterate person. In his cross-examination he has admitted that he is 8th class pass. The medical certificate in question is in Hindi. From the above evidence it appears that either everything has been fabricated or the workman got puzzled or confused.

21. In order to prove that the workman really fell ill or had been ill till 1-3-1986, the Union could have examined the doctor in whose treatment the workman had remained. But for reasons best known to the Union no doctor has been produced in the witness box, to prove the illness of the workman.

22. In para 2 of the rejoinder which has already been referred by me above it is stated that an application for one day's leave was left by the workman with Sri Khida mate on 5-11-1985. It is further stated in the said para that the mate had informed the workman that he would not be in a position to extend his leave further. The mate advised him to contact P. W. 1. Sitapur for sanction of further leave. I have not been shown any rule notification or circular of the railway board to show that even a mate is competent to grant one day leave.

23. The third question which arise for determination is as to till what date the workman remained absent from duty. in para (2) of the rejoinder it has been alleged by the Union that the workman reported for duty in the office of P. W. 1. Sitapur on 2-3-1986 but P.W. 1. Sitapur refused to take him back on duty. On the other hand it has been pleaded by the management in para 9 of the written statement that the workman turned up in the office of P.W. 1. Sitapur on 15-5-1986 after his absence from 5-11-1986, for the first time. I have carefully considered the evidence and circumstances of the case and that the management's evidence is more reliable and worthy of credence than the evidence of the Union. We have seen above that the workman absented himself from duty from 5-11-1985 onwards which fact is even admitted by the Union in para 2 of the rejoinder although later on the Union through the affidavit of the workman tried to place before the court the fact that the workman did not attend the duty from 16-11-1985. I have also seen that the Union has failed to prove that the workman's absence had been due to his illness. Above, I have also referred to the fact that the Union has not led any evidence to show that P.W. 1. Sitapur and the A.E.N. bore any enmity with the workman. In his affidavit the workman has deposed that he reported for duty in the office of P.W. 1. Sitapur on 2-3-1986. On the other hand, the management witness has deposed in his affidavit that he reported for duty on 15-5-1986. In this connection I would like to refer to Ext. M-4, which is photocopy of the letter dated 17-3-1986 from P.W. 1. Sitapur to the A.E.N. Sitapur. In it P.W. 1. Sitapur writes that he has received a registered letter on 6-3-1986 containing two private medical certificates of doctor Chandra Kumar in respect of the workman without any application. These two Private Medical Certificates were of periods 16-12-1985 to 13-1-1986 and 14-1-1986 to 13-3-1986. I may state here that in para 4 of the rejoinder there is reference of a registered letter dated 2/3-3-1986 having been sent by the workman. I have no reason to disbelieve the facts stated by P.W. 1. Sitapur in his said letter dated 17-3-86. I have already remarked that there is no evidence from the side of the Union to show that P.W. 1. Sitapur had been enmity to the workman. Had the facts stated in the above letter been wrong the Union would have certainly filed in this case the copy of letter dated 2/3-3-1986 which was sent by registered post. If there had been a medical certificate of the period 14-1-1986 to 13-3-1986 the question of the workman having gone to report for duty in the office of P. W. 1. Sitapur on 2-3-1986 did not arise at all.

24. Therefore, from the above evidence and circumstances, I believe the evidence led by the management on the third point and hold that the workman came to report for duty in the office of P.W. 1. Sitapur for the first time on 15-5-1986 after his absence from 5-11-1986.

25. Lastly we come to the question of justification and legality of the action of the management in passing the order dated 4-3-1986 that the services of the workman stood ceased under Rule 732 RI Exception H foot note 2. Note 2 says that where a temporary railway servant fails to resume duty on the expiry of the maximum period of extraordinary leave granted to him or where he is granted a lesser amount of extraordinary leave than the maximum amount admissible, and remains absent from duty for period which together with the period of extraordinary leave granted exceeds the limit upto which he could have been granted such leave under sub rule (1) above, he shall, unless the President in view of the exceptional circumstances of the case otherwise determines, be deemed to have resigned his appointment and shall accordingly, cease to be in railway employ. In sub rule (1) of rule 732 extraordinary leave without leave salary for not more than 3 months can be granted to a temporary railway servant at the time. In the present case, the workman has been found to have absented himself from 5-11-85. Therefore, under note 2 to exception 2, he would be deemed to have ceased to be in the railway employment after the expiry of the period of 3 months from 5-11-85.

26. I may state here that it has been admitted by the management witness in his cross examination that the workman acquired temporary status on 1-7-81. The question is whether before the passing of order under note 2 to exception (II) of Rule 732, the workman was entitled to any show cause notice.

27. I have given my anxious consideration to this aspect of the question and I am of the view, that justice and fair
2547 GI/92-6

play required that before ceasing his services under the said note, the railway, should have given him a show cause notice as he had acquired temporary status. Had he not acquired temporary status, the situation would have been different. After acquisition of temporary status a person becomes subject to Railway Servants (Disciplinary and Appeal) Rules, 1968. Thus what justice and fair play calls for in a situation like the present one. It could be that a person who is being treated as on unauthorised absent might have been prevented by sufficient cause in not attending to his duty. For instance on a day of rest or after doing his duty a person leaves for his house but meets with an accident and he is removed to another station where better treatment is available, then will it be just to pass an order under note 2 to exception (II) to Rule 732, in case in connection with his medical treatment he remains confined in the hospital for more than 3 months and he is unable to inform about all this to the authority concerned.

28. So I hold that the order of the AEN dated 4-3-86 cannot be upheld. It is an illegal order.

29. Hence it is held that the action of the management of the N.E.R. in passing the order under the said note 2, is neither legal nor justified. Consequently the workman is entitled to reinstatement with full back wages and all consequential benefits except for the period 5-11-85 to 15-5-86, on his furnishing an affidavit to the effect that during the period 4-3-86, to the date of his reinstatement he remained out of gainful employment. The reference is answered accordingly.

ARIAN DEV, Presiding Officer

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 13 अक्टूबर, 1992

का.स. 2571-जबकि मैं, भारत कोकिम कोल लि. के प्रबंधन से संबंधित नियोजकों और सिजुआ धोले की सेवा, वसजोरा कोलियरी के स्वर्गीय ओमनारायण पाण्डे के आश्रित श्री रवी चौधरी के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और जबकि उपरोक्त नियोजक और उनके कर्मकार श्री.वि.म. अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) को धारा 10-क की उपधारा 3(i) के अंतर्गत एक लिखित करार द्वारा इस विवाद को माध्यस्थ के लिए भेजने पर सहमत थे और उन्होंने उपरोक्त माध्यस्थ करार का एक प्रति केन्द्रिय सरकार को भेजा है।

अतः अब केन्द्रिय सरकार एतद्वारा उपरोक्त इतिनिर्णय की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में उपरोक्त करार को वाशित करना है।

करार

(औद्योगिक विवाद इतिनिर्णय 1947 की धारा 10-क के अन्तर्गत)

के बीच

पक्षों का नाम :

नियोजकों के प्रतिनिधि :

एस. एन. शिख

महाप्रबंधक (वाणिज्य)

भारत कोकिम कोल लि.

कर्मकार के प्रतिनिधि :

श्री अ.व. लाल, सहाय सहायक

आर सी एम एस/एम एल ए

पक्ष एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित विवाद को माध्यस्थ के लिए श्री एस. ए. पाण्डेय ए. ए. शिखर (के.), धनबाद के पास भेजने को सहमत हैं।

विवाद के विधिगत मासके :

"क्या सेंद्रा बंसजोरा कोलियरी के स्वर्गीय ओम नारायण पण्डे के आश्रित श्री रबी चौबी को रोजगार देने से इंकार करना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो वह क्या अनुतोष पाने का हकदार है?"

हम इस बात से भी सहमत हैं कि माध्यस्थ्य का निर्णय हम दोनों पर बाध्य होगा।

माध्यस्थ्य अपना पंचाट करार की तारीख के 60 दिन की अवधि या हमारे बीच हुए लिखित परस्पर करार द्वारा और आगे बढ़ाए गए समय में देगा। यदि उपरोक्त अवधि के अंदर पंचाट नहीं दिया जाता है तो पंचाट का संदर्भ अपने आप निरस्त माना जाएगा और हम नए माध्यस्थ्य के लिए वार्ता करने के लिए स्वतंत्र रहेंगे।

पक्षों के हस्ताक्षर
ह/-

नियोजक प्रतिनिधि :

(एस.एन. मिश्रा)

महाप्रबंधक (कर्मिक)

भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड

कर्मकार प्रतिनिधि :

ह०

ओ.पी. लाल

संयुक्त महासचिव

आर.सी.एम.एस

साक्ष्य :

1. (ह०/-) साक्ष्य

2. (ह०/-) साक्ष्य

माध्यस्थ्य की सहमति

उपरोक्त विषय पर 7-2-92 के आपके पत्र सं. सी सी सी एस. पी ई आर: आई आर: आर सी एम एस: 92 के संदर्भ में औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 के अंतर्गत विवाद में मैं एतद्द्वारा माध्यस्थ्य बनने की सहमति देता हूँ।

ह/-

(एस.के. मुखोपाध्याय)

[सं. एल-20025(32)/92-आई आर (कोल-1)]

के.वी.बी. उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

ORDER

Now Delhi, the 13th October, 1992

S.O. 2771.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Sijua Area and Shri Rabi Choudhury, dependent of late Omnarain Pandey of Sendra Bansjora Colly. of Sijua Area.

And whereas, the said employers and their workman have by a written agreement under sub-section (i) of Section 10-A of the I. D. Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration and have forwarded to the Central Government a copy of the said arbitration agreement ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of Section 10-A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said agreement.

AGREEMENT

(under section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

BETWEEN

Name of the Parties :

Representing employers :

S. N. Mishra, General Manager (Personnel), BCCL.

Representing workman :

Shri OP Lall, Jt. General Secretary, RCMS/MLA.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following dispute to the arbitration of Shri S. Mukhopadhyaya. By CLC (C) Dhanbad.

Specific matters in dispute :

"Whether refusal of giving employment to Shri Ravi Choubey as a dependent of late Om Narain Pandey of Sendra Bansjora Colliery is justified? If not, to what relief he is entitled?"

We further agree that the decision of the Arbitrator will be binding on us.

The Arbitrator shall make his award within a period of 60 days from the date of the agreement or within such further time as extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned, the reference to the arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

Signature of the parties :

Representing Employer :

Sd/-

S. N. MISHRA

General Manager (Personnel)

B.C.C.L.

Sd/-

Representing workman :

O. P. LALL, Jt. General Secy.

R.C.M.S.

Witnesses :

1. Sd/- Illegible

2. Sd/- Illegible

Consent of the Arbitrator

With reference to your letter No. BCCL/PER/IR/RCMS/92 dated 7-2-1992 on the subject noted above, I hereby give my consent to be an Arbitrator in the dispute under I. D. Act, 1947.

Sd/-

S. K. MUKHOPADHYAY

[No. L-20025/32/92-IR (Coal-I)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 9 अक्टूबर, 1992

का.सा. 2772--औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पंजाब नेशनल बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध निर्यातकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिनियम (सं. 1) धनबाद के पंचाट की प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 7-11-92 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/479/87-डी-2 (ए. 1)]

वी.के. वेणुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 9th October, 1992

S.O. 2772.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. I), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 7-10-1992.

[No. L-12012/479/87-D.II (A)]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947
Reference No. 59 of 1988

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Shri S. K. Mitra, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri M. K. Roy, Authorised Representative.

For the Workmen—Shri N. K. P. Srivastava Authorised Representative.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Banking

Dated, the 28th September, 1992

AWARD

By Order No. L-12012/479/87-D.II (A), dated, the 27th May, 1988, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the action of the management of Punjab National Bank in terminating the services of Shri A. K. Verma and appointing another person of the same name in his place was justified?"

If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The case of the management of Punjab National Bank, Zonal Office, Patna, as disclosed in the written statement-cum-rejoinder, details apart, is as follows :

The present reference is not maintainable in law as A. K. Verma, the concerned person, has raised the present claim after a lapse of 16 years. His claim is stale one. Beside, he is estopped from raising the dispute in view of the settlement dated 13-7-72 arrived at between the Bank and All India Punjab National Bank Employees Federation in the matter regarding absorption of temporary employees in the subordinate cadre. He has not come up before this Tribunal with clean hand as he has suppressed/concealed material information. He was gainfully engaged in occupation/avocation/business at Chhapra (Saran). He applied for a loan of Rs. 17,500 for carrying a business of Taxi. He repaid the loan amount alongwith interest on 1-11-83. The service conditions of the Bank employees are governed by Industry-wise awards popularly known as Desai Award/Sastri Award and Bi-partite Settlement I, II, III and IV. Desai Award has classified the employees as—(a) Permanent Employees, (b) Probationary Employees, (c) Temporary Employees and (d) Part Time Employees. Bi-partite Settlement dated 19-10-66 has defined "Temporary Employees" as an employee who has been appointed for a limited period for work which is of essentially temporary nature or who is employed temporarily as an additional workman in connection with the temporary increase in work of permanent nature and includes an employee other than a permanent employee who is appointed in a temporary vacancy caused by the absence of a particular permanent employees. The said Bi-partite Settlement also envisages that other things being equal

temporary workmen (other than Godown Keeper) will be given preference for filling permanent vacancies and, if selected, they may have to undergo probation. A. K. Verma was appointed on temporary basis during the period from 15-6-71 to 21-8-71 to work in leave vacancy of permanent employees and to cope with the temporary increase of work which was purely of temporary in nature for a specific period on different occasions from time to time. His appointment came to an automatic end after the stipulated period i.e. 22-8-71. In the meantime, the Bank in terms of guidelines laid down in para 493 of Sastri Award issued an internal circular dated 28-7-1971 for conducting the test on 4-8-71 for temporary employees in clerical cadre for permanent absorption in Bank's service. The matter of absorption of temporary employees and doing away with the practice of temporary appointment in clerical cadre was discussed between the Bank and AIPNBEF, the majority union and the settlement dated 13-7-72 was arrived at between the Bank and the Federation. The settlement provided for discontinuance of the practice of temporary employment in the clerical cadre and for providing certain percentage of leave reservist catering to the needs in staff arrangements in the branches. As regards temporary employees in clerical cadre, the settlement provides that they shall be absorbed in permanent vacancy if they qualify in the job, general test and interview depending upon the number of days of temporary service put in by them and the division secured in the graduation examination. It was further clarified in the settlement that temporary eligible employees who fail to qualify the test prescribed or fail in the interview would not be given second job test or general recruitment test on any account. The relevant provision of the above settlement is as follows : "As Second Class Graduate, who has secured between 50% and 59% in Arts/Science/Commerce/Agriculture Degree Examinations.

Temporary employees securing less than 50% marks and who had not completed 120 working days as on 5-6-71, were not eligible either for continuing as temporary hands or for sitting in the test to be conducted on 14-8-71."

Since A. K. Verma secured less than 50% marks and had not completed 120 working days as on 5-6-71, he was not eligible either for continuing as temporary hand or for sitting in the test to be held on 14-8-71. He was a 3rd Class graduate and had worked as a temporary employee for 60 days only. Hence in terms of the above settlement, he was not eligible to appear in the test.

3. The case of the concerned workman as disclosed in written statement, briefly stated, is as follows :

He was appointed as a Clerk-cum-Cashier in Chhapra Branch, Bihar of Punjab National Bank after being found suitable in a test and started to work there with effect from 15-6-71. He worked to the satisfaction of all concerned upto October, 1971 i.e. more than 90 days. Meanwhile the manager of the Bank, who appointed him, was replaced by another Manager of the Bank, who stopped/terminated his service and appointed another person bearing the same name Arun Kumar Sinha in his place. The new Manager had made up his mind to accommodate Arun Kumar Sinha in his place and with that end in view, he started cancelling/cutting his attendance. The new Manager even stopped to mark his attendance for sometime in the month of September on the plea that the same would be done after sometime when the permission of the Zonal/Regional office would be obtained to regularise him in service. Anyway, he continued to work upto October. Thereafter the Manager played fraud with and employed another person Arun Kumar Sinha in his place without permission of the Zonal Office. There was no need to appoint another man in his place as there was nothing wrong to keep him in the employment and to regularise his service. When he protested to the then Manager against the stoppage/termination of service, he was told by the then

manager that he should not be impatient. Thereafter he continued to make representations to the various authorities with the hope that his services would be regularised. He had it on information that the cases of several temporary employees, whose services were terminated, were being considered and in case the Bank would regularise their service, he expected that he would also be taken back on employment. The Bank considered the case of S. C. Agarwal, Ex-temporary clerk, Buland Shahar, H. S. Bhandari, R. K. Sharma and S. C. Varshoi, Amroha Gate Branch, Punjab National Bank, Muradabad, D. K. Sharma, Punjab National Bank, Muradabad and all these temporary clerks who were stopped/retrained sometime in the year 1972-73 were taken back in the job recently. He was under the impression that justice would be done and he would be taken back in employment. But the Bank did not consider his case. Although there is delay in raising the present dispute, even so, there is no limitation under the provision of Industrial Disputes Act. The action of the management in terminating his services and appointing another person in his place was not justified and he is entitled to be reinstated in service with full back wages.

4. In rejoinder to the written statement of the concerned workman, the management has asserted that A. K. Verma was engaged as temporary employee by the Branch Office, Chhapra in the leave vacancy caused by the absence of a permanent employee and for some additional work from time to time. His appointment was purely on temporary basis and that too for fixed period in the leave arrangement for additional work and his service came to an automatic end on the expiry of the stipulated period without any notice. He worked for only 60 days and not more than 90 days in 1971. A. K. Sinha after being declared as successful in the test was appointed. Sri Sinha was eligible for appearing in the test in terms of Bank rules as he was a 2nd Class Graduate and he had worked for more than 90 days in a temporary vacancy. Sri Verma submitted representation to the Bank. His case could not be considered as he was not eligible to appear in the test in terms of the rules of the Bank and he could not be given further temporary chance in the leave vacancy as per policy of the Bank to discontinue the engagement of temporary employees in clerical cadre. All the employees named in the written statement of Shri Verma had worked in temporary capacity for more than 240 days in 12 consecutive months and hence they were given permanent absorption in clerical cadre after entering into settlement with them in terms of provisions of Industrial Disputes Act. Hence, the claim of Shri Verma is absolutely unjustified.

5. The management, in order to justify its action, examined MW-1 J. C. Jha and MW-2 Ram Kishore Singh and laid in evidence some items of documents which have been marked Exts. M-1 to M-6.

On the other hand, the concerned workman has examined himself as MW-1 and M. K. Ray, management's representative as MW-2 and laid in evidence certain documents which have been marked Exts. W-1 to W-3.

6. Admittedly, A. K. Verma (Arun Kumar Verma), the concerned workman is a graduate and he secured a Third Class in his degree examination. He was appointed on temporary basis as Clerk-cum-Cashier in Chhapra Branch of Punjab National Bank on 15-6-71. It is the case of the management that Sri Verma was appointed on temporary basis to work in the leave vacancy of permanent employees and to come with the temporary increase in work which was purely of temporary in nature for a specific period on different occasions from time to time. Although there is no evidence on this point, the workman has not disputed this position by submitting rejoinder to the written statement of the management. MW-2 Ram Kishore Singh joined the service of Punjab National Bank in 1971 at its Chhapra Branch. He remained posted there from June, 1971 till 22-6-73. He has deposed that he knows the concerned workman and that the concerned workman joined the service of the Bank at Chhapra Branch on temporary basis during the period he was posted there. This being the position, I have no hesitation to come to the conclusion that the concerned workman was appointed as Clerk-cum-Cashier at Chhapra Branch of Punjab National Bank on temporary basis.

7. It is the irrefragable position that he was appointed on 15-6-71. It is the firm case of the Bank that the concerned workman was appointed on temporary basis during the period from 15-6-71 to 21-8-1971. But the concerned workman has claimed that he worked in the Bank during the period from 15-6-71 upto October, 1971 and in the process he had worked for more than 90 days at Chhapra Branch of the Bank. In his evidence the concerned workman has claimed that he was appointed on 14-6-71 at Chhapra Branch and worked there till October, 1971. Later, he resiled from this statement and stated that he had to work in the Bank with some breaks during the tenure of his service. His statement that he was appointed on 14-6-71 is evidently wrong for his pleading discloses that he was appointed on 15-6-71. MW-2 Ram Kishore Singh has stated that so far as he remembers the concerned workman worked in the Bank for 60 or 61 days in total during his engagement in 1971. The Bank has produced details of salary of the concerned workman which includes the period of his engagement in the Bank (Ext. M-6). From this document it appears that the concerned workman worked in the Bank from 15-6-71 to 21-8-71. This evidence is in conformity with the claim of the management that the concerned workman worked in the Bank from 15-6-71 to 21-8-71 and thereafter his services came to an automatic end. This being the position, it appears that the concerned workman worked in the Bank for 61 days in total. Hence, the claim of the concerned workman that he worked in the Bank for more than 90 days is not sustainable because he has failed to produce cogent evidence on this point and the evidence on record indicates otherwise.

8. The contention of the management of the Bank is that the concerned workman was not eligible for appointment on clerical cadre even on temporary basis. In order to prove this position the management has referred to its circular dated 5-6-71. The circular is re-produced hereinbelow (Ext. W-1) :

"STAFF DEPARTMENT CIRCULAR NO. 829.

Re : Recruitment of Clerical Staff.

Please refer to Staff Department Circular No. 485 dated 27-3-62. The minimum educational qualification for apprenticeship, temporary and permanent appointments to the clerical cadre has been revised and now fixed as a second class degree in arts, commerce, science or agriculture subject to the following exceptions, in which cases third class graduates will also be eligible :

- (i) Local candidates for rural offices at places with a population of less than 10,000.
- (ii) Candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes/Tribes.
- (iii) Candidates hailing from backward areas.

2. Candidates with 1st Class (60% marks and above) in Higher Secondary/Intermediate will also be eligible for some posts of godown keepers, cashiers and typists.

3. Cases of candidates covered by exception under (i) to (iii) and 2 for temporary/permanent vacancies will be considered and approved by the Head Office.

4. In future no candidates below second class graduates in arts, science, commerce or agriculture should be employed in permanent/temporary vacancies. All Incumbents Incharge are enjoined to strictly follow the aforesaid rule, any disregard of which will be seriously viewed by the Head Office and the Incumbents Incharge will be personally held liable for its breach.

Please be guided accordingly."

In terms of this circular the minimum educational qualification for temporary and permanent appointment to the clerical cadre was 2nd Class degree in arts, commerce, science or agriculture subject to the following exceptions in which 3rd Class graduate will also be eligible :

- (i) Local candidates for rural offices at places with a population of less than 10,000.
- (ii) Candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes/Tribes.
- (iii) Candidates hailing from backward areas.

It is the undisputed position that the concerned workman is 3rd Class graduate. There is no evidence on record that he comes within any of the three exceptions mentioned in

the circular (Ext. W-1). Hence, regard being had to his educational qualification, he was not eligible for appointment as temporary clerk of the Bank. This circular was subsequently replaced by another circular dated 22-7-71 (Ext. M-6). The authorities concerned clarified the position with regard to educational qualification for appointment of temporary employees in clerical cadre. In terms of this circular the following candidates shall be eligible for appointment as temporary employees in the clerical cadre :

- “(i) Second Class Graduate who has secured aggregate marks between 50% and 59% in Arts, Science, Commerce or Agricultural degree examination.
- (ii) Temporary employees who have secured less than 50% marks and have not completed 120 working days, excluding Sundays on 5-6-71 are not eligible either for continuing as temporary hands or for sitting in the test to be conducted on 14-8-71.
- (iii) Temporary employees who have secured less than 50% marks but have completed 120 working days excluding Sundays on 5-6-71 are eligible for appearing in the test on 14-8-71.”

The concerned workman applied for appearing at the test (Ext. M-1). But since he did not complete attendance for 120 working days as on 5-6-71, he was not found eligible for the test. This position with regard to educational criteria and attendance underwent certain changes by way of settlement between the management of the Bank and the Employees Association (Ext. M-4). This settlement was arrived at on 13-7-72. Para 3 of the settlement envisages all temporary employees eligible under the Bank rules, as on the respective dates of their initial appointment after 5-6-71 and also 2nd Class graduates recruited before 5-6-71, who have put in attendance for 90 working days or more in the clerical cadre as on 15th July, 1972 shall be required to qualify in written job test/general recruitment test at their option, whereafter they shall be interviewed and those ultimately selected shall be absorbed in permanent service of the Bank.

Para 4 of the settlement envisages—all such eligible employees, as defined in clause 3 above, who have put in less than 90 working days in the clerical cadre as on 15th July, 1972 shall be given an opportunity to appear and pass the general recruitment test and interview and those ultimately selected shall be absorbed in permanent service of the Bank.

Para 5 of the settlement envisages—Persons who became in eligible vide Staff Department Circular No. 829 dated 5-6-71 and who had put in 90 working days or more as on 5-6-71 and were not given an opportunity to sit for the job test will also be given the option to sit for the job test/general recruitment test at their option, whereafter they shall be interviewed and those ultimately selected shall be absorbed in permanent service of the Bank.

The provisions in this settlement do not ensure to the benefit of the concerned workman. He was not eligible for temporary appointment even as per terms of this settlement.

9. The concerned workman has complained that after termination of his service another person Arun Kumar Sinha by name was appointed without the permission of the Zonal Office and higher authority. This has been denied by the management WW-2 M. K. Roy has stated that the Bank did not appoint Arun Kumar Sinha in place of the concerned workman. It appears that Arun Kumar Sinha is an Honours Graduate in Economics securing more than 50% marks in Honour subjects altogether he secured 590 marks out of 1200 and secured an over-all 2nd Class (Ext. M-3). WW-2 M. K. Roy has stated that it is not a fact that as per Ext. M-6 Arun Kumar Sinha did not fulfil the criteria for appointment as clerk of the Bank.

As a matter of fact the circular is meant for ordinary graduate and not for honour graduate. Arun Kumar Sinha was appointed on purely temporary basis for a period of 30 days from 19-10-71 to 18-11-71 (Ext. W-3). There is nothing on record to indicate that appointment of Shri Sinha was either irregular or illegal or that he was appointed in place of the concerned workman. The concerned workman has further complained that the Bank considered the case of S/ Shri S. C. Agarwal, H. S. Bhandari, R. K. Sharma and S. C. Varshoi, who were all temporary employees and were

stopped or retrenched sometime in 1972-73 and have since been taken back in employment while his case has not been considered. The concerned workman has not, however, traversed this aspect of the case by evidence during the course of hearing. Even so, the management in its written statement has emphatically stated that the facts of the case referred to by the concerned workman are quite different from his case and that all these employees had worked in temporary capacity for more than 240 days in 12 consecutive months and hence were given permanent absorption in clerical cadre after entering into settlement with them.

10. Finally, the management has taken the plea that the concerned workman was gainfully employed and he secured loan of Rs. 17,500 from the Bank for purchase of Taxi and that he has since re-paid the loan. In any view, this aspect of the matter does not impinge on the claim of the concerned workman for his reinstatement in service. Anyway, the case of the concerned workman for reinstatement in service, as I have pointed out from evidence, is not sustainable and so this reference must be answered in favour of the management.

11. Accordingly, the following award is rendered—

the action of the management of Punjab National Bank in terminating the services of Shri A. K. Verma is justified.

In the circumstances of the case, I award no cost.

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 अक्टूबर, 1992

का.प्र. 2773.—केन्द्रीय सरकार राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिये प्रयोग) नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में कर्मचारियों के लिये निधि संगठन के उप क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, लुधियाना (पंजाब) को जिले के 80 प्रतिशत कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक भाव प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

[संख्या ई-11018/1/92-एसएस-1]

जे. पी. शुक्ला, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th October, 1992

S.O. 2773.—In pursuance of Sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the Sub-Regional Office of the Employees Provident Fund Organisation, Ludhiana, Punjab the 80 per cent Staff whereof have acquired a working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. E-11018/1/92-SS.I]

J. P. SHUKLA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 14 अक्टूबर, 1992

का.प्र. 2774.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 1 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 16-10-92 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4, धारा 44 और 45 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है (और अध्याय-5 और 6) धारा 76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा 77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) के उपबन्ध गुजरात राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्र में प्रवृत्त होगी, अर्थात् :—

“जिला सुरत में नगर पालिका की विस्तृत सीमाओं के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र, इन क्षेत्रों के प्रतिनिधित्व जहाँ उक्त प्रावधान पहले ही प्रवृत्त किये जा चुके हैं।”

[संख्या एस-38013/18/92-एस एस]

जे. पी. शुक्ला, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th October, 1992

S.O. 2774.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 16th October, 1992 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI (except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of

the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Gujarat, namely :—

"Areas comprising of the extended Municipal limits of Surat in District Surat in addition the areas in which the said provisions of the Act have already been brought into force."

[No. S-38013/18/92-SS.I]

J. P. SHUKLA, Under Secy.